

To be brigadier general of the line

Brig. Gen. Calvin Edward Barry, O271325, Kansas National Guard, to date from November 20, 1951.

To be brigadier general, Adjutant General's Corps

Brig. Gen. John Burriss Morris, Jr., O384787, Arkansas National Guard, to date from November 19, 1951.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and ever-blessed God, grant that this Lenten season, upon which we are entering today, may inspire us with a greater concern and interest in the culture of our souls.

We penitently confess that our daily life so frequently becomes sodden with materialism and we yield ourselves to a quest for that which dwarfs and deadens our capacities for the loftiest instincts and aspirations.

May this period of inner discipline and self-examination, of cleansing of heart and consecration of purpose, challenge us to the higher and nobler ways of character and conduct.

We pray that the day may be hastened when all men everywhere shall be brought into right relationship with Thee and their fellow men.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 382 to provide for setting aside an appropriate day as a National Day of Prayer.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman whether this is a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. BRYSON. It is, sir.

Mr. ARENDS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President shall set aside and proclaim a suitable day each year, other than a Sunday, as a National Day of

Prayer, on which the people of the United States may turn to God in prayer and meditation at churches, in groups, and as individuals.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Friday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 10]

Abbitt	Dorn	Martin, Mass.
Allen, Ill.	Ellsworth	Mason
Aspinall	Fulton	Miller, Calif.
Barrett	Gamble	Miller, Md.
Bates, Ky.	Garmatz	Morrison
Battle	Hall	Moulder
Beall	Edwin Arthur	Murray, Wis.
Betts	Hall	O'Neill
Elatnik	Leonard W.	O'Toole
Eolton	Hart	Potter
Buchanan	Hays, Ark.	Powell
Buckley	Herter	Ramsay
Camp	Hess	Rooney
Case	Jackson, Calif.	Sabath
Celler	Kennedy	Secrest
Chatham	King, Calif.	Sheehan
Cole, Kans.	King, Pa.	Thompson,
Combs	Lanham	Mich.
Corbett	Larcade	Tollefson
Coudert	Latham	Wheeler
Crawford	McConnell	Wickersham
Dawson	McGrath	Wier
Dingell	McIntire	Wood, Ga.
Dollinger	Marshall	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 364 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING CORPS ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5904) to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5904, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, during the debate yesterday the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] in emphasizing his opposition to the bill, and the fact that the action which the Congress took last year did not indicate approval of the principle of UMT, undertook to cite as his authority General MacArthur. He quoted General MacArthur as saying, referring to UMT:

While intended and designed to strengthen freedom's defense, it carries within itself the very germs to freedom's destruction. It etches the pattern to a military state—

Knowing the great respect which all Members of the House have toward General MacArthur and the great weight which they put upon his recommendations, I felt it might be of interest that you should have the full quotation from which this excerpt used by the gentleman from Illinois was taken. The source of the quotation was an article in the American Legion Magazine of January 1952, by General MacArthur entitled "The Citizen Soldier and His Role in Our National Military Policy." In that article General MacArthur says:

Now our military policy again requires revision. Under Selective Service and other statutes, we have called up large increments of our citizen soldiery with which to prosecute the Korean war and to bolster our own defense and the defense of many other lands. We have adopted the principle of universal military training and the outlook is toward maintaining for many years—even in peace—an armed readiness for war.

All this, while intended and designed to strengthen freedom's defense, carries within itself the very germs to freedom's destruction. For it etches the pattern to a military state which, historically under the control of professional military thinking in constant search for means toward efficiency, has found in freedom possibly its greatest single impediment, to brush it aside as inimicable to established military policy. To avoid this historic pitfall, it is essential that civilian control over the citizen army be extended and intensified. Particularly is this true in the administration of the program of universal military training. If the youth of our land is to avoid being corrupted into a legion of subservience to the so-called military mind.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Chairman, the Nation's defense must always be the prime concern of every patriotic American. To dismiss our responsibility to protect our homes and loved ones from the aggressor is to deny our responsibility to preserve the God-given privileges which are our rightful inheritance from the founders of the Republic.

There are those today who sincerely argue that plans for war are not the way to lasting peace. There must always be the differentiation, however, be-

tween those who plan aggressive war, in which this Nation has never engaged, and those who keep their military houses in order as the best protection against aggressors-on-the-loose.

As a Christian people we should miss no opportunity to strengthen the machinery which may be used to settle international problems by arbitration and negotiation. We must not, however, despite our determination not to promote war or entertain aggressive designs on the rights and property of other people, lose sight of the fact that those who espouse the cause of communism simply do not believe in the Golden Rule and having no respect or regard for truth cannot be relied upon to live up to the obligations which devolve upon all peace-loving peoples. Indeed, their oft-repeated statements that they are determined to destroy the democratic way of life should be all the warning we need as to their intentions and the necessity of being on our guard.

The proponents of universal military training have apparently in complete honesty advanced this plan as the answer to the need for a continuing program of defense. And I am personally not greatly moved by the arguments of those who fear that such a plan will militarize the youth of America since my own service in the United States Marine Corps taught me that your American boy will accept military duty no farther than the end of the emergency or the compulsory period. The most comforting assurance we have had at the end of every war is the cry that lifts from the throats of our soldiers, "We want to go home."

Having made this preface, I feel that I can now state with emphasis that my present opposition to UMT stems solely from the conviction that it will not produce combat soldiers and, furthermore, that it never can be fully implemented in a period in which we already have such heavy calls through the draft for the men necessary to maintain our Regular forces in combat readiness.

In addition, I feel that the military planners are putting the horse before the cart by urging UMT before they have set up a completely integrated Reserve program, since this proposal is designed primarily to induct our country's youth for basic training preparatory to specialist or advanced training in an Organized Reserve. Following World War II the military systematically sabotaged the Reserve in order to make the need for UMT more compelling and, as a consequence, there are many of us who question the sincerity in their promise to train these graduates from UMT in the specialized skills needed to make them fit for combat duty. Certainly there is no evidence that such an advanced-training program has yet been worked out and section 5 of the committee report on H. R. 5904 confirms and deplores this primary defect.

On the matter of the cost of UMT we are promised that after the first year the training program will operate on less funds. It is inescapable, however, that the military just does not do things that way and it is my personal opinion that

UMT will, instead, confront the American taxpayer with an increasing rather than a diminishing expense.

It must also be apparent to everyone that UMT is not an equitable induction plan as witness the fact that one boy can be selected for this type of training and will be faced with only 6 months' basic after which he will pass over into the comparative safety of the Reserve, while another lad in the same group will be called up under the draft for 2 years of combat service to be followed by 6 more years in the Reserve. Indeed, it is this discrimination that denies the universality of universal military training and at the same time underscores it as impractical so long as the draft must be kept in operation.

The committee report on H. R. 5904 on page 16 recognizes that the present emergency may last from 15 to 20 years, which carries with it the implication that we cannot appreciably reduce our active troops under the North Atlantic Treaty agreements or our United Nations commitments in the Pacific. What troubles me as a practical matter is how for each two men added to the Reserve under UMT we can reduce our combat troops by one, as is suggested in the committee report. Certainly Reserves stationed in this country cannot take the place of troops who are standing athwart the path of the aggressor on foreign soil. This problem is also emphasized by the fact that under the draft new men, when used as replacements, have the advantage of being put with battle-trained troops, whereas under the UMT-Reserve set-up we would have units made up entirely of men without combat experience.

In conclusion, I want to again emphasize that I am not motivated by any pacifist concept in my present opposition to UMT and I would respectfully point to the fact that I have always supported the principle of selective service and have never knowingly failed to support every legitimate request for defense funds. And when we find opposed to UMT organizations such as the Grange, the Farm Bureau Federation, the Farmers Union, the CIO, the A. F. of L., and the chamber of commerce, none of whom can be classed as pacifistic, it is all the more convincing that resistance to this program centers primarily in the belief that the stockpiling of millions of semi-trained young men is neither practical nor desirable from the standpoint of military security. As we, then, reluctantly face the fact that there is no cheap or easy way to defend ourselves we must increasingly insist that our military program be divorced of all unnecessary waste and expense and that so long as our way of life is threatened from without we must not jeopardize it from within by setting up socialistic devices for bringing to our people costly services which they do not need and which they cannot afford if we are to remain economically strong in a world in which might alone presently seems to set the rules.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I want to address myself directly to those who have been unremitting in their demands for UMT. I address myself to the Truman administration—current grand patron of this program; to the Pentagon "yes men" of the administration; to the professional drum beaters for so-called permanent peacetime conscription who view virtually all young Americans as candidates for veterans' organizations; to the perennial sponsors of UMT in this House, and, particularly, to my colleagues on this side of the aisle who, up to now, have subscribed to this item of the Truman program of bigger and bigger government. I especially urge those members of this House who have not yet made up their minds on this issue to mark my words well.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I challenge the efforts to foreclose a real decision on UMT. Last year you, the sponsors of UMT, issued pleasant and soothing reassurances that legislation authorizing the creation of a UMT commission did not and would not constitute approval of UMT. The distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, speaking on the conference report in this House on June 7, said that the report assured that "Congress must take another look at UMT." He said that it meant that "Congress would have another opportunity to examine UMT."

In good faith acceptance of this assurance, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDT] answered in the affirmative this question asked by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM]:

Is the gentleman willing to state unequivocally that acceptance of this conference report does not make it mandatory upon Congress to adopt some type of UMT program if and when the proposed commission reports a program?

That was last year. But you talk differently now. The Commission report asserts that—

Through enactment of Public Law 51, the Nation gave official approval, for the first time in its history to the principle of UMT.

On the basis of this same claim, our distinguished chairman said, prior to the recent hearings, that—

The committee expects the witnesses to direct their testimony to the plan which is now before it.

In other words, you now tell us that we are only to look at the plan. Heaven knows, the committee has seen a veritable parade of plans—the Commission's plan, the Pentagon plan, the Rosenberg plan, the Hershey plan, the Vinson plan, and doubtless we can expect still more plans as you try to maneuver UMT through this House.

I propose that we look at more than the plans. It is our duty, and in accordance with pledges made on this floor last year, our right, to take another look at UMT—at the basic idea and principle of UMT. That I propose to do.

The administration has changed its mind about how soon UMT should start if adopted, as often as it has come up with new plans. In August 1950 President Truman said—in a letter I might add—that UMT could not be put in

operation "in the immediately foreseeable future."

Last year, although he shared General Marshall's desire to get going, our distinguished chairman said it might not be possible to reach the training phase of UMT for a great, great many years. This year, many different answers have been given on this point. The UMT Commission Chairman, our former colleague, Mr. Wadsworth, said he did not know when UMT could start. On January 17, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] said that UMT may not go into effect for a great many years. Secretary Lovett testified that it is the Pentagon intention to start UMT on a voluntary basis 6 months after enactment of the law. And Mr. Lovett admitted that this early start could lead to possible misunderstandings on the grounds that the Pentagon was substituting UMT for the draft.

I do not think there is any possibility of misunderstanding. This haste to get going with UMT cannot possibly mean anything except that UMT is to become a draft system which will put men into training at 18 and into service at 18½—6 months ahead of the timetable laid down by Congress under last year's draft law. Mrs. Rosenberg made that very clear in her testimony before the committee. She said, in opening her statement:

There is the one, of course, which is called the perfect plan, to let us put it into effect right now and take immediately those who are between the ages of 18 and 19, give them 6 months training, and put them into service so that we can gain this very important experience and also begin to build up the kind of a reserve we need.

I challenge the advocates of an immediate UMT to offer any positive proof that this will not be the result. It was brought out several times during the committee hearings that UMT would replace the draft rather than start at the expiration of the draft, which was the promise last year.

While I understand that supporters of UMT are now likely to compromise on a cut-off date in order to get this legislation through, they have, throughout committee hearings, adamantly refused to place a cut-off date on the legislation. Even the acceptance of a termination date cannot alter the fact—and indeed tends to confirm the fact—that immediate operation of UMT will make it a substitute for the draft law which runs to July 1, 1955.

But it is argued that we need to start UMT immediately in order to start building up our reserve force. We are told building up this force through UMT will enable you to reduce the Armed Forces in being, and so save billions of dollars for the hard-pressed American taxpayer. I challenge that claim. I believe it is an attempt to pawn off a multi-billion dollar gold brick on the American people in order to gain your objective of an immediate UMT.

You can do just as much—no more and no less—to build up the Reserves under the existing draft law, which runs to July 1, 1955, as you could do in the same period under UMT. You can, under the draft

law, induct all available young men at 18½ for training. You can, at the end of their training, transfer to the Reserves all such young men not needed in active service. The number available under the draft for assignment to the Reserves after training will be no more and no less than the number who would be available under UMT.

Insofar as building up the Reserves will make possible reduction of forces in being, that same reduction of standing forces would be possible under the present draft law. You can give the American people performance and not just promises—and I tell you frankly, the American people are sick of this administration's empty promises.

In answer to the chairman's comments as to the lack of Reserves, you know who is to blame. We could have all the necessary Reserves today had there been any desire on the part of the Pentagon to build a Reserve under the present Draft Act.

Of course, the Pentagon has never answered the challenge issued by Mr. James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO, in his statement before our committee when he said the Pentagon "cannot get us coming and going with plans that point to a continued, large, even increasing standing armed force on the one hand, and talk about a UMT program to reduce the size of this same armed force on the other hand."

Mr. Carey was right when he added:

Realistically, there is no prospect that anyone has yet been able to unearth that the size of the Armed Forces can or will be reduced in the next few years. The proposal to start UMT under these circumstances, aside from all other questions as to its wisdom, is unreasonable.

The Pentagon has not answered that because it cannot answer it. The best Secretary Lovett could offer was the statement:

We are not at the present time aiming at an indefinite build-up in the Armed Forces. We hope to get a level-off point and then begin to slope down.

Mrs. Rosenberg's comment on this point is particularly interesting. So is Mrs. Rosenberg's logic. I quote:

We can't give you a guaranty of how soon, whether it is 2 years from today or 3 years from today, that we can discontinue selective service and start reducing the size of the Armed Forces. But we can say this, positively and with conviction, Mr. Chairman, that under current conditions, unless we start UMT, unless we build up a young Reserve which has not seen service in one or two wars before, we will never be able to reduce the size of the active Armed Forces; and not only the size of the Armed Forces as of today, but what we expect to build them to by 1953. That is not the desired size of the Armed Forces, but that is the calculated risk that the Joint Chiefs, the Secretary of Defense, and the President have decided to take in hopes that we are building a Reserve.

That is a somewhat staggering statement. I take it to say, among other things, that the Pentagon does not know when it is going to be able to start reducing the size of the Armed Forces. It seems to say that the Armed Forces are going to get even bigger before they get smaller. It seems to say that even

though the Armed Forces are going to get bigger still, they will not be as large, even then, as the administration wishes they might be. And this statement of Mrs. Rosenberg does say that the Armed Forces can never be reduced if UMT is not adopted. I wonder if we want to vote more power to a so-called manpower expert who talks in this fashion.

General Collins testified that you could not put on a mathematical basis the proposition that a build-up of Reserves would bring a reduction in standing forces. If there really is to be a cut in the forces in being, I do not know of any other basis than a mathematical one for accomplishing it. General Collins did say that the number of active-duty units here at home could be reduced if we had 2,000,000 well-trained Reserves, but he added that even that reduction would depend upon our general estimate of the world situation at that time. By adroit questioning, the distinguished committee chairman finally got General Collins to say "yes, sir" to the question: "Just as soon as we begin to build up a large, well-organized Reserve, it is the intention of the Department, is it not, to reduce the standing force?"

That is quite different than promising a reduction in standing forces after we have 2,000,000 well-trained Reserves. It took quite a bit of coaching to get the right answer from General Collins, but the chairman's efforts were finally rewarded.

Actually, the answer does not mean a thing. The promise of a reduction in the Armed Forces does not mean a thing. For that promise you expect the American people to pay billions, on top of the present defense billions, to put UMT into operation. For that promise of "pie in the sky, by and by," you ask the American people to adopt permanent peacetime conscription. But you are not willing to start building up the Reserve, as you could be doing, under the draft and without UMT. You are not willing to prove—as you have never proved—that you can operate a sound Reserve program. No, you must have UMT first.

You know, and we know, that if you get UMT you will forget the promises. The first angry grunt or sharp belch from the Kremlin will cause you to toss your glib promises of a reduction in standing forces into the wastebasket. If those promises are sincere, why have you not been proving it by full utilization of the draft to build up the Reserves?

Yesterday the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee said he challenged anyone to disprove his figures, his estimates on the savings which would be made possible through reduction of the Armed Forces if UMT is adopted. I say to the distinguished chairman that the burden of proof rests upon him. I say to him that he is the one making the claim, and it remains for him to prove it. Performance is the only proof, and the means of performance have been available, and unused, under the present draft law.

In your hurry-up insistence on starting UMT right away you are faithful

disciples of General Marshall who said that he wanted to get going. Like General Marshall you don't trust the American people. It was General Marshall who insisted that if UMT was divorced from the draft law we are sunk again. You have no faith in the ability of the American people to find the right answers except under the pressure of an emergency.

I contrast this lack of faith in the American people with the sober counsel of Gen. Douglas MacArthur:

I should advise most seriously, if I were considering the problem—of UMT—that I would wait and get through with the emergency that faces us now, and then on what has resulted and what exists then, I would sum up the facts, and make my decision.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I wish the gentleman would let me finish.

Mr. COLE of New York. Only to ask the date of the quotation, is all.

Mr. SHAFER. I will furnish that to the gentleman. It was during Senate hearings last year.

Mr. SHORT. If the gentleman will yield I think I can answer that. It was in direct answer to a specific question by the junior Senator from Texas, Mr. LYNDON JOHNSON, when the hearings were held over in the Senate less than a year ago.

Mr. SHAFER. This is the same great American who said: "I have confidence in us."

I share that confidence "in us." I have confidence in the ability of the American people to solve the problems of national security without such pressure tactics. I do not have the same confidence in the UMT plan you are trying to pressure through this House.

One reason for my lack of confidence is that you continue to dodge certain fundamental issues. I offer a few examples.

General Collins, in his testimony, opposed splitting the 6 months' training under UMT into two segments. He said:

The men would not retain enough of the basic training—

After 6 months' time—

to carry on during the second period with team training.

Yet, neither General Collins nor any of the other brass have explained how UMT would fit men for active duty, without extensive retraining and reconditioning, if they were called to service 1 year, 3 years, or 5 years after their original training.

Mrs. Rosenberg told the committee that "we will not drop any of the experiences of Fort Knox that apply to the present-day problem." But she added, significantly:

That was in 1945 or 1946 and the times have changed radically. Our type of training and our type of warfare have changed.

I assume there will be similar changes in the future. What value, then, will UMT training in 1952 have for the man called to fight in 1956 or 1958—unless he is extensively retrained?

The truth is, we are asked, under UMT, to accept a Maginot-line psychology and a Maginot-line method of preparedness. We are asked to prepare for a possible third world war with World War II training methods. And we ignore the fact that delay in putting large numbers of ground forces into action after a war starts has always been due to problems of weapons and matériel production—not the training of manpower.

And, speaking of manpower, it does not make sense to me that we should give the military an 8-year mortgage on the lives of all able-bodied young men without first carefully appraising the total manpower needs of the Nation. Those needs must be appraised in terms of agriculture, industry and the professions, as well as service in a uniform.

That was precisely what General MacArthur was talking about when he said:

I believe there are many complicated considerations. I believe the fitting in of the manpower, of the expert efficiency of the country, is a very intricate problem that can't be settled in such a broad general way as that.

That was also what Mr. James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, was talking about before our committee. Mr. Patton cited Agriculture Secretary Brannan's call for increased crop production this year. He pointed out that there was a net reduction of 329,000 farm workers in this country in 1951 compared to 1950. Mr. Patton warned that UMT would weaken the agricultural productive capacity of the Nation even more than has the draft. You cannot add to the exodus from the farms and the abandonment of farms without giving point to my question to General Hershey during the hearings: "When do we Americans start our capsule diet?"

During committee hearings I heard a distinguished representative of a national farm organization, a veteran of combat action and a Reserve officer, by the way, called a manicured farmer. I thought that was plumbing the bottom in the way of insolent abuse of a citizen for his opposition to UMT.

Yesterday, however, we heard even worse. We heard proponents of UMT offer a comment that Communists also oppose UMT and name a list of several Communist-front organizations who oppose it. This is the last resort of those whose arsenal of logic and reason is exhausted. By implication it identifies conscientious American citizens, including able clergymen, God-fearing church people, representatives of labor, farmers, even veterans of combat service, with Communists. Such a statement, of course, is completely uncalled for. However, since the statement has been made, I should like to remind proponents of UMT that they are on the side of Hitler, Mussolini, Tojo, and others who went down to inglorious defeat in the war. UMT did not save them.

Many a Member who would not dare stand up on this floor and demand socialization, nationalization of industry, or medicine, or finance, or housing, does demand the socialization and nationali-

zation of our most vital resource—our young manhood.

A pilot plan approach to the problem of building up an adequate Reserve, through full use of the draft—the approach which I am urging—would enable you to face some of these problems I have cited. It would enable you to seek the solution to difficult problems gradually, carefully, by trial-and-error methods.

But that does not satisfy the professional drumbeaters for UMT. They want the power and the glory. They want a permanent system of peacetime conscription, signed, sealed and delivered.

At the outset, I referred to the Truman Administration as the grand patron of this proposal for more power, more controls, more big Government.

UMT has been brought closer to realization today than ever in American history by the Administration of Truman, Acheson, and Marshall. And why not? It fits the pattern of that administration. No wonder manpower conferences under high administration auspices are already being held to perfect plans for telling young Americans which ones shall go to college, what they shall study, and so, eventually, who shall be the doctors, who the lawyers, who the factory workers, who the garbage collectors.

Yes, UMT is rightfully this administration's program. Certainly it is not the program of a MacArthur who so eloquently warned that "while intended and designed to strengthen freedom's defense, UMT carries within itself the very germs to freedom's destruction. For it etches the pattern to a military state."

UMT is today a favorite project of an administration in which a majority of this House, more than once, has declared a lack of confidence; an administration whose demand for immunity powers for the so-called investigator of administration corruption was unanimously rejected by a congressional committee; an administration which was called upon by this House to disclose any secret conversations or commitments made to the Prime Minister of Great Britain; an administration whose blunders in starting a war, and in trying to stop that war, have created the overwhelming disgust and distrust so eloquently voiced the other day by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN]; an administration whose request for power to license all business concerns was emphatically denied by this House a year ago; an administration whose acts of reckless and criminal folly in firing MacArthur brought a Nation-wide outcry for impeachment; an administration whose reckless dispersal of American troops around the globe brought insistence that congressional approval be secured before more troops are sent to Europe.

It is this administration for whom you, the advocates of UMT, now speak.

It is for this confused, corrupted, discredited administration that you are speaking when you seek an 8-year mortgage on the lives of all American boys through permanent peacetime conscription.

Of course, you are in a hurry. Of course, you want to get going. You—and the administration—are racing against time. You are fighting the deadline of next November's judgment day.

You are parroting the demands of a leadership which, however, adroit and bellicose in the committee room and on this floor, has proved itself incompetent in statecraft; timorous on the battlefield; ineffectual in the negotiation tent, and committed to the doctrine—unprecedented for Americans—that there is a substitute for victory.

Here is one battle, your battle for UMT, in which you brave and belligerent battlers are willing to accept no substitute for victory. And you may win. You may win the control you seek over the lives of American youth—you may win the sort of victory which, through your own folly, eludes you on the battlefield and at the conference table.

But I say to you that if you do win it will be a Pyrrhic victory.

Neither you nor the American people and the American way of life—and it is for the American people and the American way of life that I am concerned—can stand many more such victories for the cause of Big Government.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. I do not wish my remarks to be construed in any sense of the word to be even touching upon partisan politics. I do not wish them to be construed to mean that in any sense of the word the issue here is a political issue. It is not with me. Whether it may be with some others, I am unable to say.

I want to talk a little bit about a piece of legislation that has rocked this country from shore to shore, more than any piece of legislation it has been my pleasure to know anything about during the 18 years I have served in this House.

I have heard mention of letterhead organizations, and so forth. I want to tell you that literally thousands of letters have been pouring into my office, and far more than 50 percent of them were not written on letterheads. They were written on scratch tablets, and with pen and ink and pencil, if you please. And not 1 out of 500 favored this bill.

It is true that virtually all of the big organizations, or at least those we usually refer to as organizations, the church organizations, labor organizations, farm organizations, school teachers' organizations, college organizations, as far as I know, without exception are opposed to this legislation. I understood last night that some of the service organizations were 100 percent for this legislation, and I heard it said that the Legion was 100 percent for it. I have been a member of the American Legion virtually since its beginning. I have held many offices in that fine, useful, and patriotic organization. But I have never construed that organization to be one that would, through its commander, dictate the formation of my judgment. I do not so construe it now. It is a great organization and has done a lot of good, but I hope it will, through our com-

mander, get a little bit in balance, for if it does not it will lose some of the good influence it has enjoyed since its organization. A conscientious conviction is as dear to me as it could ever be to him. I respect his, and hope he will be equally generous to me and others.

I want to talk a little bit about the people of this country. There has been a lot of loose talk around here, that they did not know this and they did not know that; they did not understand this or that or the other. Let us just go back to the American family for a few minutes. Maybe there is a reason for their being worried and disturbed. Let us analyze a few trends and conditions that have confronted the average American mother and father who are raising a family in this country, and visualize, if you please, their sitting before the radio or television, reading the newspapers, and they see and hear of bad faith in government, mismanagement of their tax money, corruption, waste of funds, expansion of military power, and expansion of administrative powers, and all the time they have the feeling that their very walls are closing in on their freedoms, and the Government's powers expanding.

The trend and the tendency has been to cut down on the individual freedoms. I am not pleading innocent to my share in it; all of us have at times participated in it, in the hope and with the desire that it was best for America. But sometimes we see a different picture here from what the man sees sitting by his radio; so I say that we might say a few words in behalf of the American people. They are bitterly opposed to this legislation and overwhelmingly so; and if they are bitterly opposed to it because of what they read, see, and hear, we cannot shirk our responsibility for we are at least supposed to be an important part of their Government. If it is a good measure, then we have made our contribution toward framing their minds, and I will not shirk my share of that responsibility.

I say now that we had better look this squarely in the face. At the time of the adoption of the Constitution there was never the slightest question about where the power to declare and carry on a war should rest; that was in the Congress of the United States, the duly elected representatives of the people. But since June 1950, we have had a dangerous and deadly major war going on that has already resulted in approximately 125,000 fine young American men being killed or wounded.

The American people are asking the question: When, where, and how did the nullification of section 8 of the Constitution, which says: The Congress shall be the one to declare war, come about? When did it come about? And then we sit here and cannot understand why the American people are confused and disturbed. I think they are entitled to an answer instead of making further demands on them for a grant of more powers.

I can tell you the very thing that I think is causing the most trouble. Somebody is shaking their confidence.

So far as I am concerned all the facts should be made available to the whole Congress of the United States, and we

should either declare war on somebody and fight an objective war, or get out of Korea. We cannot laugh that responsibility off. They are burying boys in every community in this Nation. To the Defense Department it is No. 5,433 being buried; to some mother and father it is their boy. No sacrifice of that kind should ever be demanded of a people unless strict compliance with the basic and fundamental law of the land has been had. I cannot feel that it is right or good to continue to feed our boys to a veritable meat grinder under present conditions. Yes, the boys are asking questions, and properly so. I realize it is not pleasant to vote a declaration of war—I have experienced it—it will shock any man in his right mind to vote a declaration of war. At the same time it is not pleasant to fight a war. But it is our responsibility to let the people know that the war was the result of the considered judgment of their duly elected representatives and so declared officially, and we should not long shirk that responsibility. During all of this debate nobody has touched on that unpleasant subject and 75 percent of you are probably saying that it is indiscreet for me to mention it. However, I know what is honestly in my mind and I know that here is the place for me to say it, not in the parlor or on the street corner.

I have been in one war, under one, and I do not know where I am in this one. There can be no doubt about its being a war. Those who have heretofore been calling it "a police action" are now calling it by its real name, "war."

Mrs. Anna Rosenberg on Monday, February 11, 1952, over the ABC network, and I have a copy of the release—I would not trust my ears, I sent for an original copy—said, and these are her words:

We are fighting a war and we are demobilizing an army at the same time.

That was on the program Time for Defense, one of the many propaganda programs put on by the Defense Department.

Mr. Chairman, if there has ever been a time on this earth when we need to consolidate Americans, it is now. It is not the time to confuse them with an issue of this kind. If we are in the danger that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] said we are—and there is no more patriotic man in America than GENE COX—and if there is the danger lurking and hovering over us that he says, and if there is as much danger as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services says, who also stated "we may have a little time left," what are we doing here trying out experiments and working on an experimental UMT bill? We better be at our post of duty, getting ready for what may be awaiting us, if such is the case.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to work out a practical training program. I have done my best to work with those in authority on a training program that could be fitted to our American way of life. I wanted to coordinate the military with our economic, educational, religious, and social way of life. I

wanted to coordinate our military training program with our educational institutions, with our apprentice training programs, with our vocational training programs, with agriculture and industry, and such can be done and done in a manner consistent with our American way of life and in cooperation with our American institutions already in operation. But the military said, "No; subordinate or nothing."

Can you just imagine the effect that this legislation would have on the school system of America? I do not like the adamant attitude of the military. I would like for them to content themselves to stay on the other side of the Potomac and let us attend to our business on this side. It is not their job to educate and rebuild America according to their own pattern, but to defend America as is. I know there are some of the Pentagon military in the gallery now, as there were the last time I spoke on this subject, wisecracking over what I am saying. But that does not affect or bother me. I know this: I know the top officials of the Pentagon have been effective enough to close the mouths of generals and admirals. I can prove that by Admiral Denfeld and some others. If they can close their mouths with the shift of their lips, I want to inform you that a bayonet and a rifle is a pretty influential instrument. We may get our closed sometime unless the Congress exercises due caution and good sense in dealing out powers to the military. I think their place is on the other side of the Potomac carrying out the responsibilities and legislation given them by the Congress of the United States. They are useful to the Congress as consultants but not as directors.

I know what they want. They want to indoctrinate. They want to plan education. They want to carry on every conceivable kind of a school. And they have been doing just that. I want you members of the committee to know that as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor I set about with what I regard as the best research man in the Congressional Library to delve into this thing. He has done a marvelous job and the report is now finished and will be available within the next 2 or 3 days. Two volumes of it have already been made available. Would it be news to you members of the committee to know that the Federal Government during 1950 spent over \$4,000,000,000 in the field of education? Would it be news or of any interest to you members of the committee to know that the Defense Department during 1950, in running every conceivable kind of a school—not a service school for bakers, and so forth, but running every conceivable kind of a school, spent over \$275,000,000? And it is much more than that during 1951, and that is in the record over their signatures. Then we ask the question, Why should the American people be concerned over this? Yes; they teach democracy, the kind of democracy they believe in. They prescribe the textbooks. They teach that the military alone can survive. Well, now, maybe that is right, but we have been getting along pretty well with our ordinary American way of educating our

youth. Without setting up the machinery for a thought-control program by the military. That sounds too much like the famous or infamous youth movement of old Germany we spent so much to destroy.

I say to you that if you search your records you will find why they do not want to coordinate the military with the educational institutions. No; they would rather disrupt than to coordinate. I find now, even under the atmosphere of slowing down and holding back, there are 670 educational institutions in America now training reserves. I am told there are approximately 160 applications of schools over in the Pentagon that could have been training reserves for nothing, except the United States Government furnishing equipment, if they wanted to let them. In that group of 670 schools there are 328,480 students as of 1950 in the Reserves. But the minute you begin to take on the job of fitting the educational institutions or fitting our economy or fitting our industrial set-up or fitting the apprentices or fitting any other kind of a set-up they say, "No; we want the whole thing or nothing." And there is where I part.

I did not give up reaching some kind of solution of this until just a few weeks ago. I still thought there was a way to work it out, until I reached the definite conclusion that there was only one pattern, that if a part of the pattern was reached here there was another part of the pattern waiting somewhere else in another legislative body, and when they got together they would make the picture all right. I do not propose to be caught in that kind of a squeeze, and so far as I am able I am going to do my best to stop it where it is. We know we have not done right by the Reserves of this country. We know too well that we have not done right by the National Guard of this country. We know well that we can make a better showing there than we have made if the military will cooperate.

America has not always been strong by virtue of the military alone. America has been strong because of its educational institutions, its American way of life, its know-how, its productivity, and when we begin to brush aside the effect and the ultimate good to come from our institutions, industrial and otherwise, then watch out, we are headed for a pitfall, because we might remember this, that even radar, which was of such invaluable help to us in the last war, was perfected by men of an average age of less than 26. Had they not been permitted to become scientists, they probably would have been truck drivers, tank drivers, or infantrymen. I think we had better give some attention to that.

We want to give a little bit of consideration to the cost of this situation. There are but two ways to cut down the cost of the United States Armed Forces; one is, when the time comes and when it is safe, cut down the size; the other is, cut out waste and extravagance. That is all. It does not make any difference if the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] figures \$11,500—and he rolled it out as long as my arm—for each individual soldier, there is not a person in this House, but who knows that \$11,500

did not just count keeping that boy in camp. If it did, somebody ought to be shot for waste. That took into consideration all of the camps and installations all over the world; but they are not going to transfer any of that to the Reserves.

I love him like a brother, but I was a little bit interested in that he got so economy-minded that he started off talking about 52 billion, and he had not been talking long before he left off the "billion" and it was 52 million, and he had not been going long on that before it dropped down to 50 thousand, and then he said they are going to absorb that. That is what the American people have been doing for a long time, absorbing.

As delightful as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] is, and as close personal friend of mine as he is, I am going to try to see that he is given his proper place in history, because while Greece had its Pythagoras, Georgia has its Vinson, who is a better figurer than he was. He is a better mathematician than Pythagoras ever was.

There is no need to talk about this program not going to cost. We know it is going to cost. I have been furnished some figures that are equally as startling as the savings claimed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson], and I am sure they are just as reliable, which indicate that instead of saving money this UMT proposal and its huge Reserve program would cost the people of America about \$46,000,000,000 over the next 9 years, and would be an unnecessary addition to the current rate of military spending. I can prove by the chairman that I have the inalienable right to adopt these figures if I so choose.

The American people are willing to pay the insurance premium for a well-defended country. Yes; we want the Marines; we want the Navy; and we want the Army and the Air Force; and we want the Reserve—and we want our American way of life left with us at the same time.

They say we are going to save money. The only money you are going to save is the difference between the \$30 that you pay the trainee and the \$75 that you pay the trainer, because they say it is going to take one trainer to train two trainees. That is a high percentage of school teachers in my book. And that is in the Record. They are going to take one trainer to train two trainees, and they are not going to be in the Army. So here we are facing all this danger, fixing to take about 300,000 men out of Europe or Korea or somewhere and put them to training people who are not going to be in the Army. Now, that does not add up. When they come down to saying that it is not going to cost but somewhere in the neighborhood of \$3,000 to train a trainee for 6 months, that is also a high-priced college education in my book. Imagine, \$3,000 to give a boy 6 months' basic training. And that is not the worst part of this kind of thing. Go down here for instance to VMI, which turns out just as fine military men as West Point ever did. They may let them go along until the end of the college year, and then they take them out for 6 months to give them basic training. Now,

that will be cute—take a boy out of training at VMI and put him under some Regular Army sergeant to give him basic training, when they have the tanks and guns and everything else at VMI right now, which the Army uses and which the Army has. But, we are going to exempt the three service schools, the Coast Guard Academy, Annapolis, and West Point. Then to talk about not being able to fit this program to our American way of life is absurd. I do not like this business of calling on these boys for \$30 a month. The American people are willing to pay what is necessary to defend this country, and \$75 is either too much for the Regular—and it certainly is not—or \$30 is not enough for the trainee. I, for my part, am perfectly willing to pay my share of the same pay to all.

Now let us get on with this economy business for a minute. According to what the people on the Committee on Armed Services tell me, they have never discovered such waste, extravagance, and foolish spending as has been going on within the Armed Services. Now I think that is an honest statement of some of you people on that committee. Are we going to look to them for economy? Are we going to give them another blank check, and with that turn over to them the 18-year-old boys? No, not with my vote—we are not going to do that. I am opposed to the destruction of my country from within or from without. I do not think that this House can afford to do it either. We must have our vocational training programs in this country; we must have our educated boys in this country; we must have the production in this country; and we must above all retain and preserve our freedoms in this country because free men make the best soldiers on earth. Why? Because they have more to fight for. They have their freedom to fight for. That is worth everything else.

Now, we have had these boys confused and mixed up enough for the last 10 years. There has been some kind of a proposition of this kind meeting the average 18-year-old boy who is already confused, just about every week. If he is in college he studies a while and then he goes downtown to get a newspaper to see if he will be at college next week.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield briefly.

Mr. SUTTON. I understand that at Fort Meade Lieutenant General Brooks is now spending \$27,000 of the taxpayers' money to build him a personal hunting lodge down at A. P. Hill, and he also has a master sergeant as his house boy down there.

Mr. BARDEN. Well, I do not know about that. I hope that is not so. If it is, I hope he gets what he ought to have; that is, a kick in the pants, as far as I am concerned. I hope it is not so, but you do not have to go further than

around the suburbs of Washington, according to the morning newspapers, and you will find some millions of dollars wasted and misspent; and according to some of the members of the Armed Services Committee, fifty or sixty million piled up in other places.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I wish every Member of the House would get a report from the two subcommittees of our Armed Services Committee, one headed by the distinguished and able gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], and the other by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], and you will learn a little of the enormous waste.

Mr. BARDEN. I want North Carolina to claim a little of that credit. The distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] has a few secrets also.

Mr. SHORT. He certainly does, and I am sorry I overlooked mentioning his name. All three of those committees are doing valuable work for the Congress and for the country.

Mr. BARDEN. The thing that bothers me is that here is a group already investigating, and they already know how much waste has been going on and what is happening, and then they come in here with some funny figures and say, "They are right because we got them from the Defense Department." I want some better and more reliable and dependable authors of figures before I annex them to my way of thinking. That is exactly the way I feel about it.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, you have been very kind to me. I do not like this bill. I hope you have gathered that much. I could take some time going into it further, but I do want to tell you something that is really ironic. I am not going to trust my memory, but I want to read you something. We have been trying to settle the situation over in Europe, prescribing the methods of raising armies, and so forth. I want to read this paragraph from the committee hearings, page 2717:

It is a strange irony of fate that in the very moment in history when the land of Bismarck and Hitler has adopted the selective-service plan of the United States, that the United States, the land of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, should be contemplating the adoption of compulsory military training and service, which we inherit from the German state most largely.

In other words, just a few days ago the Atlantic pact, upon recommendation of the United States, adopted and recommended that Germany raise its own army by the selective service system, the system we employed when we defeated Germany the first time; the system we employed when we defeated Germany the second time; and now we are considering adopting the system that Germany went down with, and that is the so-called universal military training system, probably worse than the orthodox type. They have mongrelized it until it is very difficult to tell just what it is,

especially when you find such language as the following:

The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe rules and regulations not inconsistent with law—

Which is liable to mean almost anything. I will tell you what is the truth: You know the committee is pretty good; they have kept the situation well in hand. I started out studying the bills as they came out. First the Commission came down with their recommendation and I went to work on that; then the committee came out with a bill and I said: "Well, I will work on that a while;" and I thought I was beginning to understand a part of it when all of a sudden up came committee print No. 1. Well, I kind of "snuck" a copy of that, Mr. Chairman; I got hold of a copy of committee print No. 1. In about 2 or 3 days out came committee print No. 2. Then by the time I got No. 2 in my mind out came committee print No. 3. I said: "Now, that is bound to be the last one." But, lo and behold! a few days after that out came committee print No. 4, and then out comes the bill we have here before us, and I understand they are now trying to sweeten it up.

I can take a licking if I have to, as far as that is concerned, but it is embarrassing to be out smarted, and knowing the designs I do not want any of this amending business. As far as I am concerned I am swinging at it from the floor. I am in favor of its burial without benefit of clergy, and I do not care if you do not even mark the spot.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG].

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this proposal for permanent peacetime compulsory military training.

I do so with high respect for the proponents of this measure, on both sides of the political aisle. This is not a partisan matter, but one of paramount importance to present and future generations. There can be no personalities in our debate, but only discussion of the merits of the proposal. I mention as typical of the supporters of universal military training the distinguished and able gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], a Member who has rendered outstanding and unselfish service to his country, in war and peace; a man whose vigorous, patriotic leadership in veterans' organizations and programs has won the respect and esteem of all of us and our comrades who have worn the uniform of our country. The gentleman from Georgia, the distinguished chairman of the committee, is typical of the honorable, patriotic supporters of UMT. There is no question of motives, of patriotism, of desire best to serve our country in this time of confusion and crisis.

Furthermore, there is no division among us as to our ultimate purpose, which is to find the best possible ways and means to protect and defend our Nation and our allies in the free world from the world-wide conspiracy of Soviet communism. We are agreed that we must prevent further aggression and

another major war if possible; and if all our efforts fail and a major war breaks upon us again, we must be able to win the conflict as speedily as possible. Every official, every citizen, worthy to enjoy our free institutions, is agreed on that noble aim.

The only differences of opinion, therefore, are on methods to strengthen our position in world affairs so that governments of, by, and for the people might not perish from the earth.

Having said that, let us get down to the merits of the proposal to conscript into military training all the fit young men at the age of 18. Close study of the report and recommendations of the UMT Commission reveals that the plan is based upon certain assumptions, many of them plainly false and others so questionable as to have little value in the defense of the free world today. Let us examine a few of them:

From a military standpoint, UMT for the United States at this time is indefensible. We are now at war in Korea, however much those responsible for sending our boys into Korea without a declaration of war would like to have this country forget it. We are at war, with selective service going full blast to supply the manpower to fight that war. Will anyone contend that adoption of this watered-down plan of conscripting boys at 18 years of age for military training in peacetime would help our present war effort? Of course not. UMT would interfere with, rather than strengthen, our war effort in Korea and our defense efforts everywhere else on earth. It would hinder, rather than help, in the creation and maintenance of the only type of military force, for both offense and defense, needed to meet the conditions of modern aggression.

If I were a four-star general or admiral, I honestly believe I could advance the same arguments against UMT from a military standpoint that so many Members of this House know to be true—that is, if I were free to speak my mind, as generals and admirals are certainly not free to do today.

The truth of the matter is that we do not need UMT to win the war in Korea—if our political commissars ever decide to let our military men win it. If we are actually confronted with an impending major war, then certainly we do not need to mix a diluted peacetime UMT with our military preparedness. From all over the Nation, rise the distressed voices of parents, of teachers, of workers, of young men of military age, begging us to map a plan which will give hope for the solution of the present world crisis, before we take the plunge backward into reliance upon an outmoded, obsolete type of goose-stepping militarism, before we turn our backs on the American tradition of selective service for war and a small, effective standing army for peace, before we adopt the system that has failed to prevent wars in Europe but has helped to lead the weary peoples of that Continent into endless, needless struggles for the last two centuries.

I venture to assert that in the minds of our constituents, from whatever State or district we come, there is the growing

realization that the crisis we are in is not due to the bravery of our fighting men in past and present wars, not due to lack of military strength, and certainly not due to a lack of peacetime conscription, but due to the complete breakdown of our foreign policy. Nothing could illustrate more clearly the complete bankruptcy of national leadership today than to fall back upon an obsolete system of military conscription that has never prevented war, has never been needed to help us win a war, will not prevent modern all-out war and will not be effective if such a war breaks upon the world.

Yet we are asked to support UMT, and in public thinking it is inseparably connected with our discredited, ineffective, impotent misdirected foreign policy. Can I find no better answer for my constituents as to how we might implement our foreign policy, than to tell them we must abandon the cherished American tradition of no peacetime compulsory conscription?

The entire UMT proposal rests upon another false assumption, namely, that we are going to be cursed with these wars all around the world, as in Korea, indefinitely, and therefore we may as well build our Nation into a garrison state and accustom ourselves to live in an atmosphere of tension and turmoil forever. If there ever was a policy of fear, of helplessness and hopelessness, that is it. Actually, this is the repeatedly expressed policy of our State Department, echoed by their faithful puppets in the Pentagon. They tell us that this is the America of the future. I quote from a letter I just received from one of our chief policymakers, Anna M. Rosenberg, bearing the exalted title of Assistant Secretary of Defense, in which she says to me:

As we view world conditions, it appears that this period of unrest and grave danger may persist in varying degrees of intensity indefinitely, even if hostilities in Korea are over—just how long no one can predict.

If ever there was a policy of fear, of helplessness, of hopelessness, that is it.

While I recognize, as every official and citizen must, the fact of Communist aggression and its world-wide challenge to free governments and institutions, yet I refuse to admit that free peoples do not have the intelligence and strength to meet this problem squarely, and solve it promptly. Because of the abysmal mistakes in our foreign policies which have permitted Stalin and his Kremlin tyrants to dominate vast areas of the world with 800,000,000 people, we cannot bring about peace and security overnight. But the alternative is not a state of perpetual military preparedness. There is a better way. Let us find it. Let us meet this threat of communism not with an ineffective, insufficient, obsolete military program, but with the type of weapons needed to win this tragic struggle in which free peoples find themselves engaged.

I offer three points of a constructive program, taking into account the integration of our military, economic, diplomatic, and psychological strength. The

first two are for the immediate emergency, while we are faced with the aggressions and threats of aggressions of Soviet communism. The third is for a long-time program, for which we should now plan.

First. Let us determine the military contribution which the United States can best make to the collective security of the free world. On that score, every factor is opposed to the UMT theory. The major contribution of the United States can never be manpower—the fighting land troops which UMT would begin to train.

Our major contributions must be equipment. This means the sum total of all production for security—the scientific know-how, the raw materials, the industrial capacity, the skilled labor pools, the management, the effective distribution of every item needed for the sinews of collective security, the weapons of our international police force.

Next in order, in the contribution we in this great Nation must make, is air power. Here we excel because of our equipment and our general progress in aviation, civilian and military, since its beginning. Third in order is our naval power, in which we also now excel in all the world. Fourth is the military staff work, to which we can furnish officers and personnel for every branch and for every purpose of planning, directing, and commanding.

That leaves to other nations of the free world, our allies in this struggle, the major contribution of manpower. That is the contribution they are best equipped to make. And yet yesterday morning papers announced in glaring headlines that selective service is to be stepped up, that more and more young men are to be drafted from off the farms and from out the factories and schools of this Nation. The place of every one of these men taken from our productive capacity could be filled by two other men standing or sitting in idleness in some friendly country. This simply does not make sense to the fathers and mothers of American boys. It does not make sense to say to them, "We are going to add another burden to what you now carry—peacetime compulsory military conscription that will take every able-bodied boy away from his home at 18 years of age."

Let us set ourselves to the task of an over-all survey of the manpower of every member of the United Nations willing to resist aggression and preserve the peace of the world, and exert whatever leadership may be needed to enlist their contribution in manpower. Let us get the present war and the present emergencies out of the way, and then calmly survey the need for permanent collective security to preserve peace on earth based upon justice and order.

Second. Let us strengthen and utilize the resistance of peoples enslaved by the Communist regimes to the end that they may revolt and overthrow their Kremlin oppressors.

Here is a bold new program, and one that will take us from the defensive, where we have been in this conflict with communism, to a vigorous, effective offensive. Let us realize this great and

fundamental truth: That the struggle against communism is the struggle for the minds and hearts of mankind. It cannot be won by guns and bombs alone. The strongest weapon that we hold in our hands is truth itself. Our strongest and most valuable asset in the crusade to overthrow communism without war is the burning desire of captive peoples for freedom.

Let us then move boldly to prevent further aggression and war by a crusade to liberate the masses enslaved by communism, in all the captive lands, and in Russia itself. Our primary weapons will not be guns, but ideas. Our first task will be to give assurances of hope to the now hopeless millions of captive peoples, that we intend to work unceasingly for their liberation. Our next and continuing task will be to find and employ the best methods of strengthening resistance among the victims of Soviet enslavement, and enlist our governments and our peoples to making those methods effective.

If we adopt these two courses of action, we shall take the initiative and gain hope for the creation of a world untroubled by totalitarian dictatorships which thrive upon perpetual unrest, conflict, and war. We shall offer hope for an international order in which peacetime compulsory conscription would be as outmoded as the suit of armor or the flintlock musket.

Third. Let us map a practical, constructive program of peace—not of war. One of the clearest facts of history is this: compulsory peacetime conscription, to build up strong military units and reserves, was the very heart of the militarism of European nations in modern history. No amount of nice words can hide the fact that UMT for the United States would be an indication of our abandonment of the ideals of peace through international justice and collective security, and our relapse into complete dependence upon stark military power.

Have we nothing better to offer suffering humanity than that? Of course we have. It is a program of peace. It calls for the creation of peace by the removal of the deep and fundamental causes of war. After removal of the immediate cause of aggression and war, it holds out to peoples who have been dominated by the imperialist control of so-called favored races and favored nations that they too can be free. It holds out to the hungry the hope that through their own peaceful production they may be fed. It holds out to backward nations the assurance that through a just international order they may receive their share of natural resources and raw materials for production and trade.

And best of all, it holds out to mankind the recognition of humanity as a brotherhood, capable of living in cooperation and mutual helpfulness.

In such a future world as that, the proposal of UMT would be as out of date as policemen equipped with bows and arrows. We need not go backward through the centuries to find security and peace when with vision and courage we can go forward.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I have consistently opposed universal military training during peacetime. I have voted against it on every occasion when it was considered in the House of Representatives and I expect to vote against it when it comes to a final vote in a few days.

I hope that it will come up for a straight vote on the issues that the measure now before us raise. I hope the real issue is not lost in a maze of dilatory amendments that might be offered by the proponents of the measure when they find that they cannot pass the bill as it is now written. I also hope that the issue is not postponed by a vote to recommit the bill to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

I have pridefully, on many occasions, complimented the Military Affairs Committee and the Naval Affairs Committee of the House before their two great committees were combined together into the Committee on Armed Services. This was done when Congress passed the reorganization bill a few years ago. I opposed that measure and all subsequent events have justified my position.

I would not have you think, however, that I was or am opposed to all or any plan for reorganizing the Government when and where it is plain and patent that economy of time or money can be accomplished. But when reorganization is advocated for the purpose of giving more power to Government bureaucrats, I am opposed to it; or when it seeks to take power away from Congress, the duly elected representatives of the people, and repose it in boards or groups selected by the President or some member of the President's Cabinet or by a political gang that has for its purpose the advancement of the political fortunes of the President or his political satraps, I am opposed to it.

The bill presently before the House for consideration is the product of this legislative philosophy that seeks to restrict the powers of Congress and to supplant the Congress by a board or a commission.

In the last session of Congress a bill was passed setting up a board to study this matter of universal military training. Originally it was the intention to give this board such power as would amount to a complete supplanting of the Congress by the board. If this original plan had been accepted in toto, it would have amounted in effect to the board's having to make recommendations to the House, which recommendations would become law unless the House would by affirmative action reject the recommendations of the board. This would amount to an abdication by the House of its constitutional powers and to me it would seem to be a cowardly retreat of the House to satisfy the constantly increasing desire of bureaucracy to supplant lawfully constituted authority.

Mr. Chairman, while I am as I have stated opposed to universal military training during peacetime, I am more opposed to the pending measure because it is a surrender of the House of con-

stitutional authority that belongs to the legislative branch of government and not to the Executive.

Mr. Chairman, the Constitution gives to Congress the exclusive power to declare war and to raise and support armies. It does not contemplate that a board appointed by the President or by anyone else shall declare war or raise and support armies.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this pending measure fundamentally and eternally because it is the forerunner of dangerous legislation that must inevitably follow the enactment of this bill that we are now considering. This bill figuratively is the nose of the camel under the tent. If this bill is passed, even if it is a compromise bill, the next step will be to pass legislation that will go further and further down the road toward complete compulsory military training with all its expense and with all its dislocation of the lives and lifetime prospects of all the boys in the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, as a student in school and in college and as a teacher, I always felt that ours was a peaceful Nation with no designs on the territory or property of any other nation or people. As a lawyer and a lawmaker for many years, I have swelled with pride because I was a citizen of a great country that respected its Constitution and its laws. We fought the Revolutionary War with volunteer soldiers and won it and gave to the world an example of what a free people can do when they are harassed by an inferior and more powerful government. We fought and won the Civil War with volunteer soldiers to show the world that a government of the people, by the people, for the people could and would endure. Our heritage clearly teaches us that we must carry on maintaining our own liberties and coveting nothing that does not belong to us.

Mr. Chairman, again I say our course as a nation is toward universal peace. Germany, before the First World War and before the Second World War, was an advocate of universal military training and practiced it rigorously. Kaiser Bill brought on the First World War with results that we all know about. Hitler, the paperhanger, was an ardent advocate of universal military training and was always preparing for war. He plunged the world into a frightful war that challenged the extinction of our present civilization. He got just what universal military training brought to him and his country. History is replete with proof that universal military training leads to war.

Mr. Chairman, our face as a nation is constantly toward universal peace and not toward universal war. May we always keep it thus.

Mr. Chairman, what I have said is not a discussion of abstruse legislative principles of government. It is just what the most unlearned and unlettered patriotic citizen of our great country understands thoroughly. The parents and wives and children of many thousands of our fine American boys killed in Korea know what war is from its terrible results.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not break faith with them. I shall take their side of the issue, because the course now being taken by President Truman and his State Department is not consistent with the course Washington and Lincoln would take, and neither is it the course that General MacArthur, America's most outstanding military man, would take.

Mr. Chairman, a number of very able addresses have been made in this debate with which I agree most heartily. I especially refer to the speech made by Mr. ARENDS of Illinois yesterday and the one made today by Mr. BARDEN, a very able and prominent Democrat from North Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, I have received thousands of letters and communications from many fine and highly respected citizens from the district which I have the honor to represent. These were farmers, teachers, ministers, businessmen, housewives, and persons from all walks of life. They have not only given me their views on this pending legislation but they have implored me not to vote their sons into a compulsory universal military training Army or Navy. I have few, if any, communications favoring this UMT program provided for in the pending legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this is a controversy with the people on one side and some of the military leaders on the other. As a Congressman charged with legislating for the best interests of our people and our country, my duty is clear. I shall follow the Constitution and I shall try to do what the overwhelming number of the people that I represent would want me to do. And I shall be consistent with my past record.

Mr. Chairman—

Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light,
Protect us by Thy might,
Great God our King.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 35 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in the beginning that my decision on this matter has not been dictated by anyone. There has been some inference here at the present time that the Pentagon is dictating to the members of our committee as to how we should vote on the measure and how we should act. I first voted for this measure in 1922, when it was first presented to the first American Legion convention. I have consistently felt during all these years that we made a great mistake in not adopting some form of training after World War I. I feel somewhat like the gentleman who was supposed to follow Lord Lister, when he made one of his famous speeches in Parliament. When the toastmaster at the finish of the lord's speech turned and asked someone else to speak, he said, "No; when the nightingale sings, all other birds remain silent for fear of disturbing the music." The oratory we have heard is outstanding in rhetoric. I am not qualified to compare at all with such scholars of rhetoric. But, I have tried

in a humble way to write out and express my opinion honestly and sincerely.

My good friend the gentleman from North Carolina, who preceded me, comes from down near Roanoke Island where the first white man set foot in America. I have the highest regard and opinion of his integrity and honesty, but in this case I feel that his judgment is bad. I am going to try to point out to you some of the reasons why I think we should adopt this measure.

At the present time, and there has been some indication of it here on the floor of the House, this opposition is being hung on the mothers of America and those here in America who do not want their boy to give at least 6 months of his life in the service of his country. Think of it gentlemen. I would like to use the words of Van Dyke when we think of the mothers of this country, when he said, "Gentlemen, I love the men of the West. They have hope; they have faith; they have courage." I can say this of the American mother. She has hope, faith, and courage. If you gentlemen here today in this great deliberate body will go back to the hip roof, covered wagon days of 1700 to 1756—56 years of war—when those wagons moved out from our State of North Carolina, South Carolina, from the red hills of Georgia, from Virginia, across the Blue Ridge Mountains, Pennsylvania, and New York across the plains of Illinois and Iowa, fighting every day, every inch of their way, establishing for us here in America the greatest country on the face of the earth. The mothers of that day met their responsibility. They knew what it was to suffer and die. Think of it—56 years of war. If you do not believe it, read Theodore Roosevelt's *Winning of the West*, in seven volumes. It will give you a perfect picture of the sacrifices that the women made in that era. If that war had not been fought and won we probably would have had European states set up here in America and not be here debating this issue. They fought the French; they fought the Spanish, and they fought the Indians, and they kept right on fighting, men and women, and moved on to the Pacific Ocean. You people from the far West today, I think, should appreciate that fact.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING UNDER DEMOCRATIC CONTROL UMT—TRADITION

We have heard arguments from many of the opponents of universal military training that such a program would be undemocratic, that it would be peacetime conscription, that, if adopted, it will lead to the militarization of our Nation, stifle individual initiative, and that it will be a means by which we forfeit our freedoms; in short, it is alleged that it is contrary to the great American tradition of subordinating the military to control by the people.

These arguments are out-and-out distortion of fact. One of the primary purposes for adopting UMT is so that we may be able to reduce the huge standing Military Establishment which unsettled world conditions force us to maintain under present circumstances. Would such a reduction be a step in the direction of militarization? Of course not.

The building of a strong, trained, dependable reserve force of citizen soldiers who could be called to the service of their country in time of peril is in the best tradition of America. Those who use such arguments against UMT either ignore or fail to examine the early history of our nation where the tradition was fear of large standing forces and not revulsion at the training of citizens to defend their freedoms.

It should be made clear once and for all, the many misrepresentations to the contrary notwithstanding, that universal military training is not conscription. Conscription is compulsory military service for an extended period of time—not for a number of years. UMT is just what its name says it is—training. The first settlers in America brought individual military training with them; and it is little wonder that in the young years of our country, when danger of attack was just as close as the nearest cover for hostile bands, our forebears accepted the need for military training and the maintenance of a constant state of readiness as calmly as they accepted the need for planting their crops. During the period 1607 to 1775 the Colonies passed more than 600 ordinances and laws for the creation of effective forces of civilian soldiers. The oldest traditions of our country, then—the traditions under which our Nation was founded—included the concept of compulsory training. It was only in relatively recent years that some of those opposed to this American philosophy manufactured a new tradition which has endangered us in all of our recent wars.

Let us reflect for a moment on the sage words of our great patriots who produced American tradition. In 1790 in his first annual address to both Houses of Congress Washington stated:

To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace.

What has become of the once cherished American tradition that was born from Nathan Hale's famous words: "I regret that I have but one life to give for my country"? Why have so many otherwise substantial citizens of this Nation sought to be excused from all liability or resisted giving even 6 months to preparation for the defense of their country and closed their minds to the philosophy of that great oracle of democracy, Thomas Jefferson:

It proves more forcibly the necessity of obliging every citizen to be a soldier. This was the case with the Turks and Romans, and must be that of every free state. . . . We must train and classify the whole of our male citizens. We can never be safe until this is done.

Why is it that we have permitted these fine American traditions to be forgotten and have accepted a system which permits the courageous and conscientious to volunteer their services for hazardous duty in time of peril, while the unwilling accept the benefits of military security and yet offer nothing in the hazard of national defense? The reasons given for such shirking of responsibility are fatuous, based on wishful thinking, and dissolve before fact and experience. We have said that we

do not want to train our young men to die on the battlefields of war. It takes no training to die on a battlefield. The untrained are those who die. It takes training to live. From the moment of their birth we watch over our children, protect them, prepare them for the life ahead, teach them to protect themselves from traffic when crossing the street on the way to school. We rush them to the doctor at the first sign of illness. We save, toil, and sacrifice in order that these children may have the very best education it is within our power to give them so that they will be able to cope with the problems of life and satisfactorily solve them. At the very same time we ignore the realities of the world, and reason that since we do not want our sons to die in a war, we do not want them trained for a war, hoping against hope that the fact that they are not trained will prevent us from having a war and will prevent them from being called upon to fight. Such reasoning is obviously ridiculous. Let us take notice of the words of Gen. Henry Lee, who states:

Government is the murderer of its citizens which sends them to the field untrained and untaught, where they are to meet men of the same age and strength, mechanized by education and discipline for battle.

No; UMT is not training for death, it is training for life.

We have heard from other opponents that UMT will make militarists of our young men. What a mockery. What an insult to the boys of America, their parents, their schools, and their churches. After 18 years of his life a young man is not likely to be transformed in six short months into a militaristic automaton. Eighteen million of our citizens who are veterans of service in our Armed Forces and who have returned to their local communities to become outstanding students and civic leaders attest to the fallacy of that argument. It is significant that the staunchest supporters of UMT are civilians—members of the service organizations such as the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and so forth, as well as their women's auxiliaries and the Gold Star Mothers. These are men who have placed their lives in jeopardy and the women who are their mothers, sisters, and wives. They are not pleading the contaminating influence of military service. The program of UMT will be supervised by the civilian National Security Training Commission, and carried out by the Department of Defense which is controlled by the people of this country through their elected representatives in the Congress. Under such circumstances, the allegation that the program would lead to militarism seems absurd.

It is shocking to hear intelligent people say that we must not disturb the education or the careers of 18-year-old boys so that they may receive this training. Many, many thousands of courageous Americans have suffered and have given their lives on the battlefield from the Revolution to this day just so that these young men could pursue their careers in freedom, and so that our schools and

churches would remain the mighty institutions they are in this Nation, and for no other reason. It is bewildering that many of those who now enjoy these great benefits cannot be bothered to make the meager sacrifice necessary to prepare them to carry on the high purpose of our fallen heroes.

We can no longer tolerate a system which places the burden of preparing for the defense of America upon the willing, brave, and conscientious who volunteer while the selfish reap the benefits. Modern warfare strikes like lightning and requires most rapid utilization of manpower. We have been fortunate in the last two global wars in having had strong allies who could hold our enemies at bay while we mobilized leisurely and trained our boys. There is no assurance that this will be the case in future wars. On the contrary, it appears that because of our world-wide deployment we will be the first to be attacked and combat will be simultaneous with mobilization. At such time every physically fit young man will be needed for the defense of his country, and he will be needed fast. We owe it to every single man and boy who may have to fight to give him the necessary preparation for war now and thereby increase his chance of survival.

It is interesting to note that many of the leaders of groups opposing universal military training have never seen a battlefield, never been inside a military camp, and have never had training themselves. Few of the organizations who are opposed to the program of training have ever made any request to the responsible agencies for information and explanation of the purpose and nature of universal military training. They are not interested in the necessity for it nor the contribution it will make to our security. They disregard the threat of Communist engulfment without weighing the consequences.

It is also noteworthy that the Communist Party and their propaganda instruments vehemently oppose UMT. Communism fears UMT as a means of preparing our youth to defend the Nation just as much as it fears the atomic bomb or any other of our powerful weapons, all of which are important but completely dependent upon trained men to make them effective. This should cause some of those with honest misgivings to pause and consider.

George Washington once said at Valley Forge during that frightful winter:

This liberty will look easy by and by when nobody dies to get it.

How right he was. Is this Nation now inhabited by the sons and daughters of the vigorous and courageous men who spilled blood and were splashed out over the ramparts so that we might enjoy the benefits of a great, free democracy, or is it inhabited by a population of spineless, weak-kneed individuals?

To this generation of Americans has passed an inheritance of the greatest array of human values ever enjoyed by mankind. This inheritance was bought only by the blood, and incredible hardship, and the strain of aching muscles of men who were determined in their

conviction that the cause they were fighting for was worth while.

Some of the basic problems raised by long-range planning under Democratic control can, in my opinion, be detected by an analysis of what I have just said. Long-range planning is too often taken for granted. It is by nature more beneficial than short-range planning.

Some of our weakness has been due to the fact that we have been short-sighted and have been short-range planners. The unwillingness of our people to commit themselves to long-term plans, especially its effects that demand continued efforts and sacrifices, is an example of this. The measure which is before us today has been before the general public since 1920. There have always been, and I suppose there always will be, people on the scene who seem to have a pathological fear of any long-range program of planning in our methods of defense. To me this has become rather comical, and it has been rather detrimental in many instances, in my opinion, to our own best interests and purposes. There are those today who will argue that this long-range planning measure for defense of Christian democracy—and to me this is the No. 1 item of importance—will prove to be a measure which will bring about spiritual demoralization and physical insecurity. To get this whole matter straight I think we can ask ourselves one simple question, What kind of system are we trying to promote? This is certainly only one part of the entire defense of our whole system of government, but it is an important one. We are trying to establish here in this measure a part of our system which will be fair and the burden of which will be equally distributed in the future years before us. We can ask ourselves a further simple question today: In all of these measures we consider here, does this one fit into the framework that will likely promote a free and peaceful world? If it does and we arrive at that conclusion in our minds, I believe we can all feel conscientiously obligated to support such a measure.

Our way of life here in America is more than a promise. Our system has demonstrated what it can do for humanity. I could point out to you the accomplishments over the past 35 years—the most amazing accomplishments in the history of civilization. We have won the last two wars; we have educated more boys than ever before in college; we have increased the living standards of our people; and although some will not agree with me when I say this, I feel that America will not become weaker but that it will grow stronger as the years roll along. I do not minimize the critical problems of our age, which are many. We must maintain moral objectives and ideals. These welded together will work in such a way as to put an end to acts of violence and will promote peaceful approaches to problems which may face us.

The framers of our American Constitution believed in a responsible enlightened moral government. Those who fear that our young men will fall into moral decay because they are asked to give a few months of their time to the defense

of this great Christian democracy in the Western Hemisphere are unmindful of facts that exist in the present day period. Today there are 58 Senators and 234 Members of the House of Representatives who have served in either one or both of the past two wars. This makes a total of 292 Members of Congress, more than one-half of the membership, who have fought for their country. The head of the executive branch of the Government, our President, has seen service. If these periods of service had destroyed the morals of our society, our Government would be in a state of chaos today, and so to me that argument just does not stand up.

We are only asking the younger generation to share the responsibility of widening the rim of freedom in this twentieth century. If one cares today to examine the purposes of this country without prejudice and without bitterness and a hostile attitude, politically or otherwise, he simply cannot in fair judgment of the facts misunderstand our over-all purpose.

Today the American mission in the world is to be the effective leader in establishing freedom and order, or as our forefathers put it, freedom under law. It is a huge task and undertaking and it should evoke in each of us a prayerful humility, but we should think of and never forget from the very beginning of the establishing of our country, we have had cut out for us a heavy burden. We have always carried the hope and the faith and the courage of establishing a good society for freedom under law; and as some have said in recent years, we are just only beginning.

This is a great country of ours and the only one today able to defend itself. We were never more powerful than we are today. In my opinion, we are prepared to extend a dynamic and courageous leadership in this period.

It is a time when timidity and indecision simply does not fit into this era. I fully believe that we are able to meet the exacting tests and I believe those whom this measure will affect will in the future appreciate what those of us here today are trying to do. Our faults and our weaknesses are many, but nevertheless my faith remains the same—that is that American youth has always met its responsibility and will again do so.

Universal military training is the democratic American way to carry out that responsibility. We must do no less.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

(Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a letter and a resolution from the General Federation of Women's Clubs.)

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I have received the following communication from the General Federation of Women's Clubs:

GENERAL FEDERATION
OF WOMEN'S CLUBS,
DEPARTMENT OF LEGISLATION,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1952.
Hon. M. G. BURNSIDE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BURNSIDE: Knowing that the security of the United States is of paramount

importance to you, it is felt that you will be interested in the enclosed copy of testimony presented by the General Federation of Women's Clubs, before the Senate Armed Services Committee on February 13.

Many of these women are numbered among your constituents—the opinion of no group should carry more weight on the question of universal military training, because the protection of home and family is the primary interest of our members.

Most of us have lived through two world wars. Dry-eyed we have bid Godspeed to husband, father, sons—weeping we have returned home praying that God in His wisdom would show us the way of peace once again. We have felt through the years that there should be some transition period for our boys who, from comfortable sheltered homes, shielded as so many were from the realities of life, with far too short a training period, have gone into the grimness of battle.

We have no fear that a 6 months' training period will lead to a militarized nation, as has been expressed by well-meaning but ill-informed opponents of the legislation. We do know it will be an insurance against an aggressor nation—that by setting up this program we shall serve notice on potential enemies that we are prepared.

We feel that to be a citizen of the United States is the greatest honor given to any man—that no sacrifice is too great to maintain the ideals of our forefathers. Certainly 6 months for basic training out of the whole life of a citizen of this free Nation is not too much to ask.

Respectfully,
LESLIE B. WRIGHT
(Mrs. C. D. Wright),
Chairman of Legislation, General
Federation of Women's Clubs.

STATEMENT OF THE GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS REGARDING THE PROPOSED NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING CORPS ACT, PRESENTED BY MRS. C. D. WRIGHT, CHAIRMAN, LEGISLATION DEPARTMENT, AT HEARINGS OF THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 13, 1952

I am Mrs. C. D. Wright, chairman of legislation of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. The General Federation of Women's Clubs is the largest organization of its kind in the world. It has within the United States a membership of over five and one-half million women and 780,000 voting members. It is a truly representative women's organization, qualified to present the Nationwide views of the mothers and women of America.

During the week of May 13, 1951, at its sixtieth annual convention in Houston, Tex., the General Federation of Women's Clubs passed the following resolution:

"UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE

"Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs recognizes that conditions have forced the United States to reexamine its traditional attitude toward maintaining a large body of men trained in military science and practices; and

"Whereas the necessity to have available an adequate, equipped, and ready military force may extend over an undetermined period of years and must, therefore, provide for—

"(1) the present emergency;

"(2) the future military needs of the Nation; and

"(3) preservation of the American way of life: Therefore

"Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in convention assembled, May 1951, declares its belief in and support of a plan for universal military training and service for the United States as long as a definite threat to the national security continues and a mobilization system which—

"1. Is democratic and universal in application.

"2. Provides not a large professional standing army but a civilian reserve constantly reinforced by newly trained men.

"3. Safeguards the health, education, and morals of young people during the period of training and service.

"4. Provides for the future development and needs of our country by utilizing to maximum advantage the skills and abilities of young people called into service and by giving appropriate training to those showing particular aptitude in the sciences, for the vital professions and vocations, and the necessary social services.

"5. Is administered by a commission composed of both civilian and military personnel, with a majority (always) of civilians.

"6. Makes available the manpower of the Nation beginning at age 18."

The General Federation of Women's Clubs has favored the adoption of a program of universal military training since the submission of the Compton Commission report in 1947 and desires to reaffirm its position and urge prompt enactment of the legislation now before you.

Contrary to the belief of many people, neither the basic characteristics of our present grave danger nor the principle of universal military training as a means of meeting that danger are without parallel in our history. In the young years of our country danger of attack was just as close as the nearest cover for hostile bands. These lurked in stealth, ready to take instant advantage of any relaxation in the colonials' defenses. Our forebears readily accepted these frontier facts of life and, consequently, they prudently maintained a constant state of readiness against a foe who could, and often did, strike suddenly without warning. To those under the shadow of this constant threat the need of military training was as obvious and as calmly accepted as the need for planting maize. During the period 1607 to 1776 the Colonies passed more than 600 ordinances and laws for the creation of effective forces of civilian soldiers.

Thus, universal military training as envisioned in Public Law 51 of 1951 is not a departure from true American tradition as some of its opponents would have us believe, but is merely a confirmation of the principle enunciated by George Washington in 1783 when he wrote:

"It may be laid down as a primary position and the basis of our system that every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government owes not only a proportion of his property but even his personal services to the defense of it, and, consequently, that the citizens of America (with a few legal and official exceptions) from 15 to 60 years of age should be borne on the militia rolls, provided with uniform arms, and so far accustomed to them that the total strength of the country might be called forth at short notice. . . . They ought to be regularly mustered and trained and to have their arms and accoutrements inspected at certain times . . . (and) able-bodied men between the ages of 18 and 25 . . . drafted to form a corps in every State . . . to be employed whenever it may become necessary in the service of their country."

I appear before you not only as the representative of the largest women's organization in the land but as a mother of three boys, all of whom have had wartime service in the Armed Forces. Therefore, I am confident that I speak for the vast majority of American women when I say that while none of us want our sons, husbands, and brothers to have to fight wars, we realize that the present world conditions are such as to constitute a threat to our existence as a free nation, and that the preservation of our most sacred possessions, our homes and loved ones, may well depend upon our ability to defend ourselves against this threat. Therefore, if our men are to be called to bear arms in defense of their country, we feel that it is only fair to afford them the opportunity

of proper and adequate training. We have been fortunate in the last two global wars in having had strong allies who could hold our enemies at bay while we mobilized leisurely and trained our boys. There is no assurance that this will be the case in future wars. On the contrary, it appears that because of our world-wide deployment we will be the first to be attacked, and combat will be simultaneous with mobilization. We owe it to every single boy and man who may have to fight to give him the necessary preparation for war and thereby increase his chance of survival.

With specific reference to the plan for universal military training which was developed by the National Security Training Commission, I believe that it is adequate to achieve the objectives desired from the program and should be placed in effect as soon as possible. There are sizable numbers of our young men who are not being called upon to serve in the Armed Forces and, therefore, are not being trained. These boys would have to fight just as soon as the country became involved in an all-out war. The time to prepare them is today—not after the war begins, when it may be too late.

In closing, I should like to make reference to two of the most common arguments against universal military training by opponents of this program and to tell you why I believe them to be fallacious.

Some individuals contend that to adopt a program of UMT will indoctrinate our boys and our Nation with militarism and will result in the loss of our personal liberty. Fourteen million of our citizens who served in the Armed Forces during World War II and returned to their local communities to become outstanding students and civic leaders attest to the fallacy of that argument. It is significant that the staunchest supporters of UMT are civilians—members of the service organizations such as the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and so forth—who have seen military service, as well as their women's auxiliaries, and the Gold Star Mothers. This program will be supervised by a civilian commission and carried out by the Department of Defense, which is controlled by the people through their elected representatives in the Congress. Under such circumstances, I can foresee no danger of our country becoming militarized.

We also hear the charge, voiced by opponents of UMT, that our boys will be subjected to all sorts of demoralizing influences in the camps where they receive training. The Bible tells us that if we bring a child up properly, he will not depart from the ways of righteous living. A boy of 18 will be subjected to no more demoralizing influences in a military installation than in a civilian community or on a college campus. If by the time he reaches 18, he has not developed the character to resist temptations in an army camp, neither will he resist them in any civilian community. Military installations of today, with their planned recreational activities and wholesome atmosphere, as well as close and continual controls over young men in training, certainly do not present as many moral hazards and pitfalls as those confronting young men in civilian communities and on college campuses.

UMT will result in strengthening the moral fiber of our youth and, consequently, of our Nation. By bringing together young men from every part of the country, from every walk of life, to share in a common experience and to fulfill a common obligation to their country, a substantial contribution will be made to the development of national unity—the bedrock of our security.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 16 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I voted against opening the door to conscrip-

tion last year and I intend to be entirely consistent by voting against the vicious implementing program now before us.

In the first place, this bill reeks with subterfuge and plain deception, not only in its intentions but in its very wording. Every possible effort has been made to deodorize this decayed foreign import. We need look no further than the first page for the first example. I refer to the lyrical title, "National Security Training Corps Act." The American people know this bill provides for universal military conscription, and it should be so titled. The people have been doused and deceived with perfumed titles to such an extent and for so long that they are nauseated. Certainly universal military training, or UMT, sounds and looks less obnoxious than universal military conscription, and, indeed, the proponents, and those who voted with them last year, thought it was salable. What a rude awakening has been their lot to discover that, to the American people, who are usually far ahead of official Washington on practically every issue, universal military training meant exactly what it is—universal military conscription; that a louse is a louse for all of that, to paraphrase Burns. Yes, how the complexion of this arena has changed since last year. Only the die-hards, by now, have failed to recognize the obvious will of the people, and a sorry bunch these die-hards are, whistling in the graveyard and persisting with their phony title, terms, and catchwords.

To sniff more perfume: Beginning on page 4 of the bill, and throughout thereafter, we have "trainee" instead of "conscripsee"; and "training agency," instead of "conscription agency." Anything to try to make the bill fragrant.

In case anybody thinks this charge is farfetched, look at lines 6 and 10, on page 13 of the bill, and see the pains the committee took to amend the honest but harsh-sounding word, "draft," in favor of the sweetened "selective service." If the conscription drumbeaters are not trying to put something over on the American people, why are they afraid to call a spade a spade? None of us should fear public opinion. We are elected and paid to serve public opinion. I for one am perfectly willing to drag this scheme out in the open, in front of the people, where, like the mackerel in the moonlight, it can shine and stink.

The deception in this bill is symbolic of the moral degradation of these times wherein right seems to be anything you can get away with, and wrong only that which you cannot get away with.

Universal conscription is simply another Old World importation which has been a contributing factor to the downfall of every major power putting it into effect. We have won all our wars without conscription, and we do not need it now.

The hue and cry for universal conscription is part of the international malignancy eating away our freedom, standard of living—and American lives. International militarism, always hungry, has drunk deeply of American blood and thirsts for more. No doubt its fangs drip with anticipation at this bill which

could throw 18-year-old American boys into combat after 6 months of so-called training, perhaps to replace the 18 to 25 thousand Americans who have already died in Korea, the thousands of other Americans maimed, wounded and diseased, and those yet to be consumed in that war in which the battle lines stand almost exactly where they stood at the beginning 18 months ago—longer than United States participation in World War I.

It matters not that the spider-web banner of the United Nations waves over the graves of the unreturned dead; the bodies, on our side, are mostly Americans or South Koreans, a sickening indictment of how few are the so-called friends we have in the U. N. when the blood flows. How many more Koreans, promoted with American lives, including the conscriptees envisioned in this bill, are planned through the United Nations organization in which we are outnumbered 7 to 1 on a population basis and 59 to 1 on a voting basis, 3 to 1 by Russia?

Winston Churchill, the modern-day British raider, told you recently he wanted American boys to help quell Middle East revolts against centuries of British colonial tyranny. Do you propose to make available to him 18-year-old American conscriptees? France would like to have 18-year-old American conscriptees do the dying in Indochina. Do you want to make them available? If you do not think this could happen, think back a moment to June 25, 1950—Korea.

Yes; universal military conscription would complete the sell-out to the same brand of international despotism and intrigue which American patriots, at great sacrifice, hoped they abolished forever in 1776, but which now threatens to destroy us.

Is it coincidental, or is it a part of the same international plot, that only a few days before this legislation came before the House, propaganda bugles blared in Lisbon, Portugal, with the announcement that the people of the United States are committed to a \$300,000,000,000 proposition, under the so-called North Atlantic Treaty Organization, to furnish equipment and troops for the so-called Western European army, sometimes called the Eisenhower army.

In an historic underestimation of the intelligence of the American people, the announcement implied, while carefully omitting definite statistics to back up the implication, that the fantastic cost of \$300,000,000,000 would be prorated among the members of NATO. I am at a loss to understand how anyone could expect the American people to swallow that in view of the fact that NATO countries, since 1945, have hornswoggled American taxpayers for between twenty and twenty-five billion dollars—including seven billion to Britain and four and one-half billion to France; that, only recently, Britain was handed another \$300,000,000 and France an additional half-billion dollars for the avowed purpose of preventing the collapse of what remains of the teetering economy of both nations.

Thus, who is gullible enough to think these countries will foot any such thing as prorated share of the \$300,000,000,000 for the so-called Eisenhower army?

The Lisbon announcement came as no great surprise to me, or to my constituents, because, on February 14, 1951, more than a year ago, I stated publicly in a news release widely circulated in my district that Eisenhower, in his testimony before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, let slip what might be the forerunner of one of the most startling spending schemes of all times, and at the American taxpayers' expense.

Testifying in favor of the Truman-Rosenberg universal military conscription scheme, the forerunner of the legislation now before us, Eisenhower let it be known that he expected to have considerable trouble as European commander because of what he called unequal pay of troops of various countries. He then admitted that the subject of equalizing pay will be considered later. It took no crystal ball to figure that one out a year ago, and it takes none now.

I said at the time that obviously the seeds had already been planted, fertilized, and watered for the American people to subsidize the pay of every foreign serviceman under Eisenhower's command. But as it turned out I was too conservative. The cat is now out of the bag. We are committed to subsidizing far more than the pay of foreign troops. We are committed to subsidizing practically the whole thing—\$300,000,000,000 worth.

There can be no doubt about it. The financial burden will be ours. And will it be any different with respect to manpower? Remember, NATO countries are members of the United Nations. We have seen in Korea how our alleged foreign friends in the U. N. perform when the shooting starts and when it comes to furnishing human gun fodder. With these so-called foreign friends of ours, Korea has been, "Let's you and him fight." That's the way it will be in the NATO army, too, and everybody knows it. Under the legislation before you, 18-year-old conscripts could be available for the lion's share of the NATO army, alongside whatever foreign troops show up. These 18-year-old American conscripts could be tossed in the same pot with Eisenhower's favorites—what he described before the Senate subcommittee as the free-companion type of soldier, aliens enlisted in the United States Army along the lines of the French Foreign Legion—those, he said, "with adventurous spirits or disappointed in love"; those, he said, "who make soldiers that he would be delighted to have," those, for whom, in his testimony, he shed crocodile tears as regards their pay because, to quote him, "During World War II the comparative wealth of the American soldier made it easier for him to buy the wine in the villages and spend more money on the girls."

We can only assume from this that Eisenhower's NATO army is envisioned as a sort of international foreign legion, and, like all foreign legions, a haven for rascals, cutthroats and fugitives of practically every nationality and description, alongside of which, in the hoary ranks,

could be 18-year-old American conscripts. Those of you who support this universal military conscription bill had better be devising some way of perfuming that to the parents of the 18-year-olds you insist on grabbing for the international military.

From the inception of this legislation last year, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee has been willing to water it down—anything to get even part of a foot through the legislative door and I have no doubt he will offer or sanction further amendments to this proposal if necessary to get it through.

The deal is to get this thing through the House and into the hands of the other body. I predict here and now that if this conscription scheme is approved in this Chamber, in any form, it will come back here, as a conference report, in the form that the Pentagon wants it. Even though I were not opposed to the principle of this legislation, I would be opposed to the Pentagon, and a hand-picked and padded commission of international meddlers, writing a law which will directly or indirectly affect every fireside in this Nation. How much longer is this House of Representatives going to farm out to the President and his specially anointed commissions the duties and responsibilities for which we were elected?

I urge you to beware of those supporters of this bill who, under the 5-minute rule, will come bearing beautifully wrapped gifts in the nature of so-called clarifying and economy amendments. They know that this House stands today as the one obstacle to enactment of this nefarious Truman-Rosenberg scheme.

Prepared by certain people connected with the House Armed Services Committee is a print alleged to contain pertinent questions and answers to this bill. I am intrigued by the following which appears therein:

While it may appear on the surface to be unfair to induct one young man for 6 months and to induct another young man, a year older, for 24 months, it must be remembered that it is a lot fairer than the present system.

It must be taken for granted that the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee [Mr. Vinson] approved this committee print and therefore is a party to this indictment of the unfairness of the present draft act. Well, what steps has he taken to correct it? Or does he offer his legislation as a cover-up for failures of the past to make the draft act fair and equitable?

If the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee had spent even a fraction of the time he has devoted to slipping this scheme on the doorstep of the House to correcting the inequities in the draft act, he would not now be in the position of indicting himself.

If a lesser period of training is adequate as he admits it is in this bill, then why not cut the period of service under the draft and spread it to a greater number?

But why a huge conscript army, anyway? Do we or do we not live in an atomic and jet propulsion age? Is it

contended here that these developments are myths—that like the Athenians and Romans of old we must maintain huge armies, and in order to provide an excuse for maintaining them, make sure that they are periodically engaged in battle?

I have no doubt that in the foreseeable future we could defeat the Russians, but who among you here dares predict any other fate for this Nation than that which befell the Athenians and Romans as they themselves corroded under the weight of their military machines and collapsed upon the shambles and ruins they had made of Sparta and Carthage?

I believe in adequate defenses for this Nation, but I have no patience whatever with those who point to Pearl Harbor and Korea as evidence of military unpreparedness that would have been solved had this diabolical octopus of 18-year-old conscription been fastened on the Nation.

The tragedy of Pearl Harbor and the early days of the fighting in Korea rests in the main upon a little clique of individuals in Washington, D. C., who failed their responsibilities and who have never, for some mysterious reason, been punished. It was a comparatively few Japanese planes and warships that produced Pearl Harbor—not masses of invading troops.

It was the withdrawal of 50,000 combat troops in Korea that wrote the invitation and opened the gate to invasion from the north. It makes no difference whether we might have had 2,000,000 conscripts in training and 5,000,000 Reserves in June 1950, the same fumbling and bungling in Washington would have produced the same results.

And are our memories so short that we cannot recall the French Army of 1939? Built of class upon class of conscripts, and class upon class of reserves, it was touted as the finest European army in the world since Napoleon. I have no doubt that statements were made to that effect on the floor of this House at that time.

As everyone knows, the Germans, using air power and mechanized equipment—not masses of troops—shattered and scattered that army of more than a million men to the four winds in a matter of days. Have we learned nothing from our own bitter experience and that of others? When is some official of Government, in or out of Congress, and including the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, going to tell us and the people we represent why we have not the planes to meet the Russians on equal terms over Korea, and who is being held accountable for that failure?

Why are we outnumbered? If the Russians are willing to commit their planes to Korea we should do likewise. If the quality or quantity of our production is inferior we are entitled to know it now.

I recall very vividly two full days of so-called orientation conferences which I attended at the Pentagon Building following the adjournment of Congress in the late fall of 1949. I was the only Member of Congress present. The late and distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Bates, was flying to Washington from his home to participate in

those conferences when he was killed in an air crash.

If memory serves me correctly, every member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as other military and diplomatic notables, appeared personally and spoke to those assembled. Time after time, and from the lips of speaker after speaker, I heard a variation of the following: "If an enemy moves at 4 tomorrow morning, we'll be ready at 5." That, remember, was after 50,000 American combat troops had been withdrawn from Korea in the face of repeated warnings from the South Koreans that trouble was brewing on the north. Were we ready?

Now the Members of this House are apparently expected to have full confidence in, and accept as administrators of the most sweeping conscription program in the world today, the same military hierarchy which has not met its responsibilities to the Nation in its latest hour of need. I refuse to be a party to any such proceedings.

The time has come to compel the military to stop its wanton waste of men, materials, and money.

And the time has come for Truman and his administration henchmen to move out of that little world of make-believe in which they live, face the facts of life, and stop mortgaging the economy and the future of our people on the quicksands of borrowed money and one alleged crisis and emergency after another.

There appears to be no doubt of the parentage of this legislative monster we have with us today. As far as I can determine, it was sired at the White House; its birthplace is the Pentagon Building and it has been wet-nursed by the Committees on Armed Services. It is to the undying credit of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SHORT) and some of his committee colleagues that they have refused to have a hand in putting diapers on this hybrid which could open new fields for the distribution of deep freezers and mink coats, and unlimited professional opportunities for the wearers of the brass and braid.

Procurement of equipment, food, and clothing and construction of training camps to implement the terms of this proposal, mean the spending of untold billions and in the light of present experience—plenty of graft.

There is no valid reason for fastening permanent military conscription upon this Nation. The draft act, volunteers, National Guard, and other training units are capable of supplying the necessary manpower needs for the defense of the United States, and in this connection it is high time Congress put an end to the use of American boys as targets in every shooting gallery in the world.

I warn you that enactment of this legislation, combined with present foreign policy, is one of the last steps to permanent, complete centralization of Government in Washington and regimenting of the people. The very life of this Republic—this democracy and all its institutions: economic, educational, cultural, political, and religious—demands diffusion, not concentration of power.

This is the only country to which I owe and have sworn allegiance. I re-

fuse to undermine and betray it by supporting this legislation which will mire the American people only deeper in debt, in the moral degradation of foreign exploitation and corruption; and which will be an admission to the world and ourselves that we have lost faith and hope for any possibility of peace in the world.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. ROGERS).

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, last week the voice of a great patriot of France was heard throughout the world. The distinguished Chamber of Deputies was silent, it was still, as Georges Heuillard, a soldier of France and the Deputy from the Seine-Interieure made his way to the rostrum. Crippled and scarred, his battle-shattered body was assisted to the Speaker's tribune. As he stood there with hearing aids hanging from both ears, his twisted body supported by his strong hands on the tribune, his courageous honorable face looking out over the Chamber to his Deputy colleagues, he began to speak. His subject was the rearmament of Germany. As he began to speak the Chamber of Deputies was tense. It was a dramatic moment. It was a critical moment for the Government of France. Everyone there seemed to sense that this was not a political speech. They knew he was once again mustering all of his strength for his country. His plea was eloquent. It was a moment of greatness.

He spoke of the horrors of the war with Germany and related the oath he had taken with other soldiers of France, never to permit Germany to again recreate her military strength.

I am going to die—

He shouted, and turning to his Foreign Minister he said:

Monsieur le Ministre, I am going to die because of the German army.

In conclusion he cried out:

I have fulfilled my mission. I had promised my comrades to do it. I am happy that destiny today should have enabled me to replace the force which I lack with the energy to come and cry to you. Beware of Germany. Beware of Germany.

With deep seriousness I can say to you that if you visit the military hospitals throughout America and talk with thousands of soldiers of America with their shattered but honorable bodies as I have over these timeless years, I know you would find they would cry out too: Beware of Germany. Beware of Germany. If you will talk with the thousands of mothers and fathers, sisters and brothers who treasure so dearly the memory of their own glorious hero, I am confident they will tell you: Beware of Germany. Beware of Germany.

Deputy Heuillard, not only kept the faith with his brother soldiers of France, but he kept the faith with his brother soldiers of America, of Great Britain, of Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Greece, and the entire free world.

The rearmament of Germany within 7 years after the end of the great catastrophe in which Allied power smashed

the invincible German military might and industrial power is almost unbelievable. It is illustrative of the times in which we live. The rising fury of Russian communism makes this bold move necessary. In the defense of Western Europe I believe Western Germany not only has much to defend but also has a duty to perform for the free nations of the West. Not only does Germany have a duty to perform but also a duty to prove her intentions and ability to cooperate with the western nations.

Because of this fact Germany is in no position to bargain. She is in no position to demand concessions for the rearmament of the German legions. Germany must prove herself beyond all reasonable doubt if she is to be admitted into association with honorable nations. She must establish her honor. The employment of force is not the soil in which to grow honor. Honor is nourished from truth and right and faith.

German invasions from Bismarck to Hitler not only have left their scars on Western Europe but have shaken the entire world. By force Germany tried to control all of Europe. By force she would conquer. By force Germany pressed her objectives. By force, German diplomacy functioned and operated. Twice within this generation we have seen this method of achievement by force broken, only to see it rise again. Now once again it appears that German leadership is turning to this old method of force.

Because Germany believes her armies are indispensable to the western nations she has decided to extract concessions. She has decided to force the Western Powers to accept her as an equal by—

First. Requesting membership in the North Atlantic alliance.

Second. Demanding a return to German control and use of the Saar.

Third. Requesting the establishment of a complete sovereignty under a peace contract. This involves the withdrawal of all allied troops and controls within Germany.

Fourth. Demanding the setting up of a clemency board having a majority of German members for the review of convictions and sentences of all German war criminals.

Fifth. Demanding the reestablishment of the German general staff.

If the German soldier is to be used in the new European defense army the German people, as represented by the Bonn Government, state these demands and others must be met. Here is the old method of force in operation again. Here it is again in less than 7 years after it was supposed to be annihilated for all time.

Force them to meet our demands if they want our armies, cries Western Germany. Force them to pay our price. Upon a moment's reflection I believe you will conclude the price is too high. It is sovereignty and the re-creation of the German Army and in the end the entire German military system. It is the re-creation of the great German armament industry. It is the re-creation of Germany might. I say this price is too high. The Bonn government under the leadership of Dr. Adenauer, is the reconstruc-

tion government of Western Germany. It cannot adopt the methods of the defeated and discredited leadership of the past. The method of force cannot be used against the nations of the North Atlantic community. Because of misused German might the world of our time is struggling to save itself. Time, time will never erase the memory of wrongdoing but a change of spirit can. Let us experience a new German faith nourishing a new German soul of kindness, understanding, and cooperation among the nations of mankind. If freedom is to prevail in this struggle with communism the free nations must not resort to Communist methods. The methods of cooperation, understanding, and faith only can bind the free world together.

I believe German troops should be used in the new European army of defense now being formed under General Eisenhower. Germany is just as much involved as the rest of Western Europe and more. German troops employed in the European army can help to relieve the great strain placed on the United States and other countries of the North Atlantic community. I do not subscribe, however, to the use of German troops on the basis demanded by Western Germany. German troops must be completely under allied direction and leadership. The re-creation of Germany's industrial might must not take place except under rigid and adequate guarantees to the western allies. Germany must be made to clearly understand that the only way she can rise again as a sovereign nation and gain the respect of her Atlantic neighbors is by the method of cooperation with the Western Powers and not by force. Germany must clearly understand she has to earn her way back into the trust and confidence of free nations. Germany must clearly understand that Russian communism is her enemy and can cause her doom just as it can any other nation.

It is well to remember our tragic world will never gain peace if monsters are created to subdue monsters. Let us not create another monster. From an old enemy let us welcome an honored friend. Let us master the age-old problem of man's inhumanity to man.

Deputy Heuillard, of France, the world has heard your cry: Beware of Germany. Beware of Germany. Through your two hearing aids I hope you heard the thunder of the great ovation given you by your distinguished colleagues in the Chamber of Deputies. Today, I wish that you might hear the continued ovation ringing throughout the world of free men and women.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, as one who has been an independent in this House for 14 years, and voted for those measures only which I felt to be the right measures, I think I can say that I am going to speak upon this subject without any political influence of any party.

I want to recite a little history to the chairman of the Armed Service Committee and some of the other friends of

his in this House, that no universal military training nation ever had a long history. It has invariably fomented war. For the past hundred years Germany adopted that system. Instead of educating the young men for peace they educated them for war. When the iron hand of the military, Prussia, got hold of the situation, the German people lost control of their government. During both of those wars there was nothing wrong with the German people. They lost control of their government. We do not need to read history today to tell you what became of the great German Empire, that we now hope will be strong to aid us in preserving the peace of the world. It has been destroyed, and destroyed by themselves.

Did not Italy try the same thing? And look at Italy today.

Some say that the great military example is Rome. It adopted this program, and where is Rome today? Rome was not conquered by the fierceness of the German tribes of the north, Rome was conquered because of the system she set up of compulsory military training to the extent of abandoning their farms. You do not have to labor through the pages of history to find that the great Roman Empire exists today only in the ashes of the past.

Greece is another example. We do not have to read history to understand that Greece is no more the great power in this world.

The next example of it is Russia. Russia is a great military nation. They have to be military because they have to control the people of their country. The people do not dare to express themselves. They must be under the military, and they are training their young men today not for peace, and yet they talk peace; they are training their young men for war, and everybody knows it.

Are we going to do the same thing? Is that what we are going to do? Do you suppose I want to be a Member of this Congress and vote a big reservoir of men for anybody to use anywhere, any time, for any purpose, when the Congress of the United States is denied the right given to it under the Constitution? I had nothing to say about the present war and you had nothing to say about it. You had no chance to exercise your right under the Constitution.

You say it cannot happen here in the United States; but it can. It can happen again because it has happened everywhere it was ever tried. Young men schooled in war, young men schooled to kill and destroy and spend, makes them different men.

The next point I wish to make here is that this program is economically unsound. In the draft you depleted the farms of my section, the bread basket of the world, where we raise more wheat than any other State in the Union, hard wheat, without which you could not have bread. We have appealed to the Army to leave some of those boys home, or at least enough of them to run the farms. But, do you know what they say to me? They say, "Why these boys on the farms are skilled mechanics and we need them to run these tanks and operate these guns. Go and pick up somebody

else and hire them to run your machines." They do not realize that farming today is a great scientific undertaking, and that the horse and buggy days of farming have gone. These men who operate these machines have to be skilled mechanics, and most of them are. You can imagine our going out, I will say to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs—imagine us in North Dakota going out and hiring some soda jerk from New York to run a combine. He would not know whether he was running a combine or some new invention of television. And the damage they do is more than they get in pay. We had an instance the other day when a farmer in North Dakota lost two boys, and wanted to keep his other boy at home. But, they said they could not let him stay at home because they needed him to run these machines. Now that farm will be abandoned. The father wrote me that the stock would be sold. Nobody seems to care in the Army about the food of the country. The greatest power of defense that this country has is its power to raise food. They tell us that in the history of the United States that we defeated the South in the War Between the States and that we whipped them. We did nothing of the kind. They starved out. Every war that humanity has ever seen which was ever finally won, was won because the other side did not have food. But, yet these Army officials will take the last boy even though two of his brothers were killed on the battlefield, and close up that farm because the brass hats are in control.

This universal military training will take more men from those farms, and the first thing the Army knows, and the first thing you know, we will have a shortage of food. The United States is in a position of great national leadership. How did they get it? We acquired that leadership from the time of the beginning of this Government in 1789 up to 1914. During that period we became a great Nation. We were respected throughout the world. But, in 1914, we made a fatal mistake of entering on a program that all our great colonial leaders said we should not enter. We entered World War I. Why did we enter it? I will repeat the words of President Wilson, whom I greatly admired. We entered this war "to make the world safe for democracy." We poured out our blood and our money and exhausted our resources. When the war was over, was democracy safe anywhere in this world—even here? So, we accomplished nothing. But, in World War II, the administration had a better slogan, and this, too, came from a man I greatly admired, President Roosevelt. He said that we were going to banish fear and that that freedom of fear was one of the four freedoms that we were going to establish throughout the world. Fear was the cardinal principle underlying all four. Since that war ended has there been fear in this world anywhere? Why, we have had nothing but fear ever since. Fear prevails today. So what did we accomplish in that war?

Now, in the third war, which some say is a police action, but I never believed

that—the third war is to stop communism. We are going to stop it from spreading. We are going to any part of this globe, any time, any hour, to put it down, not by persuasion, but we are going to shoot it down. Some of you are so patriotic perhaps you never studied anything about communism, but I have tried to find out what it is so I can say what it is. Communism is an idea and you cannot stop an idea with a gun. Communism works when people are in distress, when they are hungry and homeless. That is when communism works. If we had spent half the money on the peoples of the world to insure them against that situation of dire need, we would have accomplished a great deal more than we have with guns. People who are in distress do not ask what kind of a system they are going to get. The Chinese did not ask what kind of title they would get for their land in China, but they have now discovered they did not get any. But they were hungry at the time, and they embraced communism. Many people think the first line of defense against communism is in Europe, but I want to go on record this afternoon by telling the American people and this Congress that our first line of defense against communism is right here in the United States. It never started anywhere on earth unless the people were in distress and hungry. This Nation can be dragged down to a position where our people are hungry and homeless; when we have depleted our resources, lost our young men and piled up a stupendous debt, and in that condition communism will find a fertile field. Then communism will spring right up here in the United States, and Russia will not have to land a single division. Yet, we say our first line of defense is in Europe or some other place across the seven seas.

Now, what is the present situation? Western Europe thinks that the Russians are going to take them, and we have encouraged that thinking. So we have gone into this Atlantic Pact; a hundred divisions; \$300,000,000,000 more. Who finally is going to pay the money? Who finally is going to furnish the men? You remember what Churchill said in World War II. I heard him right here on this rostrum. He said, "All we want you to do is to give us some money and some materials, and we will do the fighting." I said, "That is all right. I am for you." But they started out, and they did a little fighting. They got up into Norway, a long ways from home, and the fighting did not stop, and war raged on the Continent. He came right back here and he said, "I just want you this time to send us some token forces to show the world which side you are on." So we did. We sent them token forces. Pretty soon we discovered that Churchill was right back here again, and he said, "Boys, I am going to tell you the truth this time. I led you on before; but, by the eternal, you have got to do the fighting now, because we are holding that crazy Hitler away from the United States." He scared a lot of people in this Congress stiff.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlemen five additional minutes.

Mr. BURDICK. Then while England moved out of Norway in the nighttime and when they "skiddooed" in their boats at Dunkerque we had to invade France and do the fighting—and I mean we did the fighting. But we could fight only so much. We could have taken Berlin in 24 hours. The Germans pleaded with us to come and take them, but we did not do it; the administration held up those armies until the Russians could come in; held them there until the Russians did come in. Now, have we any complaint to offer against Russia's getting into Germany when we made it possible for her to do it?

At Potsdam who gave the Russians the circle of country around Berlin so tight that we had to fly airplanes to get food in. Who created that situation? The administration.

Russia has never gone anywhere without our consent. We abandoned the Baltic Republics; we abandoned Poland and Czechoslovakia and gave them free run in the Balkans. We abandoned South Korea because we pulled out. I remember what our Secretary of State said. I have never condemned him, because I knew he spoke for the President, not himself. He said: "Korea is no part of our western defense." We pulled out and the Communists came in.

Who established the Russians in North Korea? The administration. We set a line and put them in there.

Who was it that encouraged the defeat of the Nationalist Army in China? The administration did. I remember hearing Marshall say that with 1 stroke of his pen he dissolved 18 divisions of the Nationalist Chinese Army. The administration is responsible for the collapse of the Nationalist Chinese Army. Now we are fighting against all these mistakes, we fear Russia, and yet the facts show that Russia has never gone in with her armies any place except with the consent of the United States. Read what happened at Yalta and Potsdam, and you will see the administration gave everything Russia asked.

I was inexpressibly proud of the action taken the other day by the Legislature of Virginia, where the voices of Washington, Jefferson, Patrick Henry, James Madison, James Monroe, John Marshall, and John Randolph resounded in that legislature, which voted overwhelmingly to oppose any attempt to put this great Government into the strait jacket of a world government.

Those American citizens who are now traveling over this country with propaganda advising the American people to go into this world organization and submerge the dignity of this Government, the authority of this Government, the sovereignty of this Government to the control of a world government—I say they are the enemies of this Republic.

I do not want to live to see the day when the Stars and Stripes of this great Republic shall be hauled down and supplanted by the insignia of a world government which now waves over many training camps in this country. I do not want to surrender free speech and a free press or see our citizens tried for

offenses in any court except a court of the United States. I do not want a world government to pass conventions—laws—which will set aside the laws of this Government and the laws of the various States. Yet that very thing is not only being attempted here, but courts have already upheld these conventions.

Why do we stand here idle while our country is being destroyed? Why are we willing to make more men available to strengthen the hands of this insidious attempt to destroy all the builders of this democracy have brought down to us? Do the people of this country cherish liberty? Are they willing to surrender all the previous rights of freemen? I think not, and I refuse to vote for any more reservoirs of men to be shot, wounded, and murdered in prison camps in wholly aimless wars. When this country is in danger, Congress will not fail to act and citizens will come forth by the millions to defend it.

I stand today just where I stood when I swore to defend the Constitution of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic. So long as I can utter a word, I will in the defense of that Constitution. As long as I remain in public life, my every effort will be to preserve here on this continent the greatest experiment of democracy that was ever devised by freemen.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, during the brief period in which I have been a Member of Congress, I think I have never encountered a bill which more properly should be recommitted for further study and clarification than H. R. 5904. Winston Churchill once referred to Russia as a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma and I think this description might well apply to H. R. 5904 because some of its most ardent proponents admit privately that the bill is so loosely drafted as to make it difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain just what results will be achieved if the bill becomes law in its present form.

I must confess, however, that I can think of one salutary result which will be obtained through the passage of H. R. 5904: if this bill, together with the committee report and a transcript of the debate, falls into the hands of the Russian general staff there will be as many conflicting opinions within that group as to how this country intends to meet its manpower requirements for the armed services and Reserve components as there are members on that general staff.

May I say at the outset that I have maintained right along that until the potential explosiveness of the international situation was alleviated some kind of UMT program in this country appeared inevitable.

Prior to the issuance of the committee report on H. R. 5904 my replies to those who wrote me in support of UMT were brief and to the point. In effect I said that very reluctantly I had reached the decision that in the absence of iron-clad guaranties to insure world peace UMT was a necessary adjunct to our national

defense, and that I would support any fair, realistic and workable means to achieve this.

On the other hand, the letters which I wrote in reply to those who had expressed opposition to UMT were much more detailed and comprehensive in scope. I felt that it was incumbent on me to try and justify my position in the minds of those among my constituents who challenged my thinking with respect to the question at issue.

It has not been difficult for me to share at least partially the views of those who oppose UMT in principle or question the validity of many of their objections to it. However, I do consider it highly important that we dispense with the altogether too prevalent tendency toward wishful thinking and alert ourselves to existing realities. It seems to me that we must be fully cognizant of the fact that our world has changed drastically since most of us first saw the light of day; that we are faced with an unprecedented situation and that, in some degree at least, we must be prepared to deviate from traditional practices however repugnant such innovations may be to most of us. Recently James Reston suggested in a New York Times article that however much we might wish to, we simply cannot repeal the twentieth century and I think the sooner we realize this the better.

It is my conviction that had we been more realistic in our thinking following the end of World War II; had we been less naive in our attitude toward Soviet Russia and more conscious of the tides of hatred, ruthlessness and designs for world conquest emanating from that nation; and had we maintained our armed strength, either activated or in the form of a Ready Reserve, at a level commensurate with the dangers besetting us we would not now be confronted with the greatest threat in our history as a Nation, American boys would not be fighting in Korea and we would not be keeping our fingers crossed against the possibility of further outbreaks in a world from which we cannot escape.

Most of us will agree that Russia respects nothing except superior force, and keeping in mind the nature of our adversaries I think we must anticipate a prolonged period of international tension which can be held in check only if the United States and the other free nations are in a position to take swift, retaliatory measures against unprovoked aggression when and if this occurs.

It has been my contention right along that if Congress were to authorize a UMT program now which would become operative when this was possible on an equitable, efficient, and practical basis such action in itself might well nullify the need for actual implementation of the program, for the leaders in the Kremlin are realists and if they become convinced beyond doubt that America cannot be lulled into any sense of false security, and will keep itself constantly on guard against any eventuality Russia may decide that it is in her own best interest to give up all dreams of world domination and agree to work out any problems, real or fancied, on a peaceful basis. This may be but a forlorn

hope on our part, but one thing is certain—we must be adequately prepared if we are to maintain the peace or be in a position to win a war if we find ourselves with no alternative other than to fight.

There are those who say that we should not have peacetime conscription in this country. With that I agree. But I also submit that with more than 100,000 casualties in Korea we are, to say the least, in a twilight zone between peace and all-out war and are likely to find ourselves in this position for an indeterminate number of years.

In a general way then, these thoughts are those which I have advanced in an effort to persuade some who do not look with favor upon UMT that they should reexamine the premises which lead them to their present conclusions.

But in taking a stand in favor of UMT I never inferred that I would vote for any UMT plan which might be presented to Congress for its consideration. I would be opposed to a suggestion that the age bracket for those eligible for UMT should be between 15 and 50. Likewise I should vote against any proposal to conscript women. In other words, my attitude toward UMT generally will not be reflected by my vote on this bill. If, after the debate has been concluded and amendments have been adopted, I am of the opinion that the provisions of this particular bill are not sound or equitable, I shall not feel under any compulsion to vote for it simply because I have advocated a system of universal military training in the past.

The announced objectives of the provisions contained in H. R. 5904 are: First, to insure an adequate defense without the excessive costs involved in the maintenance of a large standing Army; second, to provide equality of service for all citizens eligible for such service; and, third, to broaden and expand the Reserve base so that men who fought in World War II or those serving in the Armed Forces at present will not be faced with the possibility of immediate recall to active duty in the event of hostilities at some time in the future.

With these objectives I am in complete sympathy, but I seriously question whether they can be realized in any appreciable degree under the provisions of H. R. 5904. For to my mind this bill is so riddled with inconsistencies, uncertainties, and inequities that the claims made by its advocates at best must be regarded as mere hypotheses. I don't think anyone knows or can determine on a basis of sound analysis that any of the objectives which I mentioned earlier can even be approached if this bill becomes law in its present form.

Numerous figures have been quoted to indicate that huge savings may be anticipated in the event that this bill is passed. For example, we are told that the cost of keeping one man in the armed services for 1 year is \$11,000 and that the cost of maintaining a man in the Ready Reserve for a similar period of time is only \$1,434, so that a net saving of \$9,566 per year per man is easily obtainable. Such a reduction sounds fine and very easy to accomplish but, in my judgment, the possibility of

reducing the size of our Armed Forces substantially in the foreseeable future is so remote as to be scarcely worthy of consideration. So, for the time being, hopes of achieving this aim must remain somewhat illusory.

Incidentally, I tried to obtain a breakdown of the \$11,000 figure represented as the cost per year for maintaining one man in the armed services, and was informed that I would have to obtain this information from 35 different agencies. Knowing that it would be impossible to even locate each of these 35 agencies before action on the bill had been completed I gave up my attempt to obtain pertinent cost data. This situation does suggest, however, the need for a central statistical bureau where such figures could be correlated. Actually, I believe this figure of \$11,000 was determined by subtracting the capital expenditures of the armed services from total disbursements and dividing the difference by the number of personnel in the services.

It has also been suggested that savings in the amount of \$13,000,000,000 annually eventually can be achieved if this bill becomes law. But eventually may mean 10 years or 50 years. While some explanation has been given for the projected savings of \$13,000,000,000 annually at some indefinite time in the future, it seems to me that the variables involved preclude any accurate computation and that this figure of \$13,000,000,000 was arrived at simply by subtracting one hypothetical figure from another hypothetical figure.

Now if this bill is passed just what happens? Does it mean that a UMT program will be implemented at once? It does not. Until the President by executive order or Congress by the adoption of a concurrent resolution determines that the period of service required under the Universal Military Training and Service Act for persons under the age of nineteen can be reduced or eliminated no one can be inducted into the National Security Training Corps. When or if the President or Congress will see fit to take the necessary action to effectuate a UMT program is a question which I am unable to answer. But when and if such action is taken by either the President or Congress, it will mean in effect that the minimum draft age for service in the Armed Forces has been raised from 18½ years to 19 years. In other words, this increase in the minimum age will reduce substantially the number of men who otherwise would be available for the armed services under existing law.

The number of men who are leaving the armed services this year just about equals the number who are entering them through enlistment, re-enlistment, and induction under Selective Service. If persons between 18½ and 19 years of age are no longer available to the Armed Forces, it will be necessary to draft men in the older age groups, many of whom have family and other responsibilities, if we are to maintain the Armed Forces at their present strength.

Now if UMT does become a reality what happens to the 800,000 young men who would be eligible each year for this training? Only 50,000 or 60,000 would

go into the NSTC. These favored few will serve for 6 months; others of the same or of approximately the same age will serve for 2 years in the armed services, and still others will be able to avoid any service whatsoever by reason of acquiring a deferment status when they reach 19. To my mind such a system represents anything but equality of treatment. Heaven knows that there are enough inequalities under selective service; let us not bring these into any proposed UMT program.

If manpower shortages make it difficult to carry on NSTC and the Selective Service System concurrently, there remains the problem which would have to be faced at some time of how we are to effect an equitable transfer from one program to the other. The two systems are separate and distinct, each having a different purpose and thus there is inherent in the situation the difficulty of bridging the gap between them. Selective service is now responsible for obtaining certain numbers of men who are members of the Regular Armed Forces. Apparently NSTC members will not be considered as members of the Armed Forces. The purpose of the present system is to build up combat-ready forces to 3,600,000 or possibly more whereas the purpose of NSTC is to insure a well-organized Reserve system. The present system implies the imminence of the threat of war whereas UMT implies the hope and possibility of peace but a peace based on prepared strength.

Until it is feasible to implement a UMT program on a much larger scale than is contemplated at present I do not think it will be possible to reduce the size of our Armed Forces to any appreciable extent. It is going to take a long time to develop an adequate Reserve strength among nonveterans if we only train them at the rate of 50,000 or 60,000 a year. And I am afraid, too, that those who now or soon will constitute the bulk of our Reserve forces will be old men before they can pass this responsibility on to those who have received their training in NSTC.

As long as we are faced with an undiminished threat of war we must maintain our armed services at top strength and, obviously, this presents a serious obstacle to the successful execution of any UMT program. But I should like to make it very clear that I am perfectly willing to vote now to authorize a UMT plan which will become operative just as soon as it can be carried out on something other than a mere skeletonized basis. I think each physically fit young American regardless of who he is or where he lives should render the same service to his country as that required of his contemporaries if we are to have a real universal military training system.

I think H. R. 5904 contains so many obvious defects that it should be recommended to the Committee on Armed Services for further study and clarification. I believe if this is done the committee can develop a plan which many of us can support with a clear conscience and which will be just and fair in all respects.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman has stated that he would support a UMT bill, but this bill is not the kind he wants. Will the gentleman do the House and the committee the pleasure of setting out what he thinks should be the type of UMT adopted, so that we can have the benefit of his judgment on that?

Mr. PROUTY. I am afraid that would not be possible in 1 minute.

Mr. VINSON. I know that, but the gentleman has all the time he wants. He has tomorrow and the next day, and he will have time during the consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule. The House would like to have the benefit of his judgment. He is for UMT, but he says this bill is wholly inequitable.

Mr. PROUTY. When all boys eligible for UMT are treated alike, then I am for it. I shall probably have more to say concerning this matter if I am able to obtain recognition under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman show us how they should be treated, and where we have failed to do that?

Mr. PROUTY. Instead of taking 800,000 boys who will be eligible each year for UMT, you are taking 50,000 or 60,000 and putting them in the UMT program. The rest of them may have to serve in the Armed Forces.

Mr. VINSON. May I say that there is not a line in the bill as to how many go in—50,000 or 60,000 or 70,000 or 80,000 or 100,000.

Mr. PROUTY. I think that is one of the things that is wrong with it. I want to know how many are going in.

Mr. VINSON. I think the gentleman is just trying to dodge the issue. He wants to be for UMT, and at the same time he says that he is against it because of some undetermined inequalities and discriminations.

Mr. PROUTY. I am for universal military training when it is fair and equitable to all the boys who are eligible for universal military training. I do not like the inequalities which seem so apparent in this bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Many of the farmers in our part of the country, and many of the farmers in my State, are experiencing a critical manpower shortage under the present Selective Service System, and they are worried as to what a universal military training program on top of a selective-service program will do with regard to this particular problem.

Mr. VINSON. May I state to the gentleman that the chairman of the Training Commission stated with reference to seasonal agricultural workers, which means the sons of farmers, that they would be liberal with reference to those deferments.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Further with reference to the point raised by the gentleman from Connecticut, at the committee deliberations, as the chairman knows, I offered an amendment, which would allow each trainee to select the month in which his 6 months of training would start. That was accepted by the committee in principle, but because the amendment had not been drafted as to its technical implications, it is not in the bill. But, I expect to offer an amendment, and I am confident that it will be adopted. If adopted, it would answer the gentleman's question concerning manpower in the field of agriculture to the extent at least of allowing the farm boy to start his 6 months' training in the winter months.

Mr. VINSON. Along that line, may I call the committee's attention that the Commission's report says that they recognize the need for young men in agricultural work and the need for seasonal deferments, but that such deferments should not be continued for an extended period, and that there should be no other occupational deferments.

So, the Commission went on record as stating that the only occupational deferments they recommend are for agricultural workers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the American Legion. I am very proud of the Legion, its leadership, and its program. I have never known the American Legion to stand behind any cause which was not for the best interests of the United States of America. Last night I was invited with other Members of the Congress to the Legion congressional dinner. When I left Capitol Hill to attend that dinner, I assumed and I hoped that the national commander of the American Legion would discuss the burning issue of this hour—universal military training. Don Wilson, the national commander, did just that very thing, and, in my mind, he did it very forthrightly. I was not surprised nor was I offended in any way. I saw the ovation given him, both before and after his speech, and I did not note many Members of the Congress leaving the Chamber as has been stated here today.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Did not the Members of the Congress of both the House and the Senate stand up and cheer the national commander both before and after?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is just what I said. In his remarks before the Members of Congress, the commander was accurately interpreting the mandates of the Legion's national convention at Miami last year. Speaking in behalf of our fighting men, as he has the right to do, he put it right on the line just where

the American Legion stood on this issue. He said in effect just this, "Members of the American Legion have been campaigning for this thing up and down the United States of America for the last 34 years. We believe most sincerely that it is a safety factor, dedicated to the best interests of our country. We are being told that the American Congress will not face this proposition properly in an election year, but we, the American Legion, do not believe that this is so. We are continuing this fight and of course we are going to keep tabs on the votes."

Now, what is wrong about that? It was an exercise of the right of freedom, this frank statement of Commander Wilson.

Now, back in the spring of 1945 the leading nations of the world were gathered at San Francisco in a conference to build what they called a United Nations Charter. Among the newspaper men attending that convention was Gould Lincoln, representing the Washington Evening Star. On May 31, 1945, he sent to his paper in Washington the following dispatch:

SAN FRANCISCO, May 31.—Moscow's announcement of the biggest peacetime military-training schedule ever ordered in the Soviet Union, with thousands of 15- and 16-year-old boys called up for Red army training, lays an emphasis on national defense, an emphasis which should not be lost sight of in the United States. Not because this country need expect or fear war with the Soviet Union—there is every reason to believe that the two nations can and will live at peace—but because of the wisdom of universal military training.

Twice within a quarter century the United States was caught without adequate military forces when attacked. It can happen again. This country, along with Russia and the other United Nations, is at work in San Francisco on a charter for a world organization to maintain peace. It is a great adventure. Nevertheless, the United States must take adequate measures to insure its own safety, certainly until it has been proved the world intends to live in peace.

For months there have been pending in Congress proposals to establish a universal peacetime military-training system. Similar proposals were made after the close of the First World War, but were kicked aside. If they had not been thrown into the discard, the whole course of history might have been different, and this country might not have been compelled to fight the greatest war of all time, war which is not yet ended.

In order to avoid giving an impression that the United States was talking of world peace in San Francisco while in Washington Congress was preparing to set up universal military training, the House Committee on Future Military Planning laid the training proposals aside. "Let's do nothing to rock the boat" was the argument advanced. "Let's wait and see what comes out of the United Nations Conference." The Soviet Union is more realistic. It has gone right ahead with its plans for peacetime defense training. At the same time it has joined with the United States and the rest to form a peace organization.

Everyone hopes the new organization will work 100 percent. No one knows whether it will or not. In any event, it still remains for the great powers to be in position to enforce peace by arms, if necessary, and to do so they must have military strength. This country has huge armed forces today. But even now partial demobilization has begun since the war in Europe ended. The sooner

a military training plan for the years ahead is developed, the better. President Roosevelt had come around to the support of such a plan. President Truman can give it added impetus, if he will, with a special message to Congress.

Russian Lt. Gen. N. N. Pronin, chief of the training administration of the Commissariat for Defense, announcing the call for Russian youth, said, "General military training in the present period should be conducted on an even higher level than in the days of war. The peaceful period into which our country has entered should not lessen our attention to the problems of defense." He stressed, too, the value to the youth of the nation of military training, for physical hardening, for the inculcation of decisiveness, endurance, stubbornness, and initiative.

The Charter of the proposed world organization for peace refers to possible future regulation of armaments and disarmament. The military staff committee, which it proposes to set up to aid the Security Council, is to look into such matters in the future, but its main job is to assist the Council on all questions relating to military requirements for the maintenance of peace. Obviously, any question of limitation of armaments or of disarmament lies in the dim future. It's up to Americans to prepare for national defense in the world as it is today.

Mr. Chairman, it was on June 1, 1945, that I made my first speech on the floor of this House for universal military training. I stressed the fact that whether we liked it or not we lived in a hard-boiled world, one that I had seen with my own eyes in my visits to our fighting boys on many fronts. I pointed out that bitterness, intolerance, hatred, and suspicion still plagued the hearts and minds of men and we could ill afford to let our defenses down while the Soviet Union went all out in building theirs.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to make reference to the address just made to the membership by our distinguished colleague from New Jersey. I, too, was at the meeting last night; I, too, have been a member of the American Legion for a long time, a very long time, and I always enjoy the association of my Legion comrades. But I was quite disturbed by the remarks made by the national commander last night; I thought they were distinctly unwarranted in certain respects. In the first place, the program that is here outlined and in the act that was passed last fall to which most of us acceded in the hope that some improvements would be brought in at this time—that act and this one together do not carry out the program of the American Legion for universal military training. The Handbook on Universal Military Training, published by the American Legion some time ago advocates, for example, a training period of 17 weeks, not 6 months. It also has a great many other differences from the program that is here brought before us.

Last night following the dinner it was my privilege to sit with some of the top officers and commission members of the American Legion, some of whom I have known for a great many years. Those questions were placed before them and they freely admitted that what I have

just now said is quite true. Unfortunately, some of our great organizations in the United States, and I say occasionally my beloved organization, the American Legion, attaches itself to a fetish; anything with the initials UMT on it is very liable to be approved by many members of that organization. As I talked it over with them last night I said: "You could hang those three initials on a skunk and be for it, but that would not make it smell any better"; and they admitted it. I went one step further with some of these gentlemen; they are old-timers in the American Legion, just as I am. I asked: "Have you read the bill and its predecessor to which it alludes? Have you read in this connection the other acts which are directly involved with it such as the Reserve Act, the ROTC Act, and certain other acts? Do you not think you ought to give this the same careful study that is required to be given by the Members of Congress before you take any such position?" They agreed with me that they should have so done. These men, of course, are not the present officers of the American Legion; they are some of the past leaders and present advisers and some of them have served a long time.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes, if the gentleman from Georgia will yield me the time he consumes.

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure. I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I judge from the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from California that the complaint he finds with this bill is that it does not follow the pattern of the length of training set up in a Legion proposal.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. I merely spoke of that as one element of the American Legion program which is certainly not carried in this bill.

Mr. VINSON. I was going to say that I judge the gentleman was for 4 months instead of 6 months. Did I not gather that from the gentleman's statement?

Mr. HINSHAW. No; the gentleman is assuming something which is incorrect and I cannot consent to accepting those as my words. I have not made them at any time.

Mr. VINSON. I thought the gentleman was pointing out a difference between this bill and the American Legion bill and said that was one of the differences.

Mr. HINSHAW. No; I did not say the American Legion bill. I said the American Legion universal military training program as set forth in the manual published by them shortly after the conclusion of World War II and which they are still following in all branches.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. May I ask the ranking minority Member if I will be able to get a little more time in the event I need it?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I am sure my colleague will agree with the statement I am about to make that regardless of the viewpoint of the American Legion, of which the gentleman and I are members, it is still our responsibility as Members of Congress to use our own judgment on bills before us. Does not the gentleman feel that way?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes. We are responsible, we are absolutely responsible for every action taken here in this body. It is our responsibility alone and we must assume that for ourselves. We are delighted to have the guidance, the advice, the counsel of any agency in the United States, including all of the veterans' organizations. As the gentleman from Georgia very well knows, my record in support of the national defense is just about as good as anybody's in this House. Nobody has any complaint I know of about that; and I am willing to discuss any aspect which I am competent to discuss at any time.

There have been hopes on my part that this committee would go carefully into the relationship between this bill and the Reserve Act, correct the Reserve Act where it needs to be corrected, improve and add to it where it needs to be added to, and there are a great many places where corrections and additions could be made.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman was responsible for that act and did a fine job; however, this act was not before him at that time.

Mr. BROOKS. The able and distinguished gentleman from California has long been most intelligently interested and constructive in the interest of proper national defense. May I say to the gentleman that when the Reserve Act came out it was acceptable universally to all of the units that were affected by it.

Mr. HINSHAW. I agree with the gentleman and thank him for his kindness.

Mr. BROOKS. I think it is still acceptable to them.

Mr. HINSHAW. I voted for it, but this is a new unit which has had no chance to take a look at the Reserve Act as it affects them under this one.

Mr. BROOKS. The Reserve Act contemplated an act of this sort and it will operate perfectly when this act is passed.

Mr. HINSHAW. If I had about a half hour I could discuss some of the effects with the gentleman because I have had the privilege of sitting in with some of the top experts in the United States Government, by invitation, if you please, who have to do with the technical and scientific manpower of the Government. They are very, very fearful that this act will not permit the satisfaction of even the needs of Government, let alone the municipalities and government contractors, in reference to scientific and technical personnel requirements and that extends on into all industry.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, assuming I could prevail upon my colleague to allow an extra minute to be yielded to the gentleman from Cali-

fornia, I wonder if the gentleman from California would yield to me?

Mr. HINSHAW. I will be delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman who is a distinguished and veteran member of the Armed Services Committee, and, with me, a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from California one additional minute.

Mr. COLE of New York. I would like to have the gentleman help me and give me some guidance. I am not a member of the American Legion nor the VFW, never having rendered military service. I do sense my responsibilities as a Member of Congress in providing for the national defense and seeing that our Nation is secure.

Mr. HINSHAW. We all have that responsibility.

Mr. COLE of New York. Now, to the extent that the recommendations of an outside organization might influence my judgment, what would the gentleman's recommendation to me be: Should I be guided by the recommendation of a farm organization, a labor organization, a church organization, or an organization composed of citizens who have rendered military service to their country? To the extent that those people may influence my judgment, to which should I give greater reliance?

Mr. HINSHAW. On a problem of this sort, in my opinion, it is up to every Member of Congress to listen to anyone who wants to talk. It is his responsibility to make a decision, to act in what he believes to be the best interest of his country after considering all aspects of the matter.

Mr. COLE of New York. What is the gentleman's recommendation to me?

Mr. HINSHAW. In what respect?

Mr. COLE of New York. As to which organization I should listen?

Mr. HINSHAW. Listen to all of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. McCORMACK] having assumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5904) to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for tomorrow be vacated and that I may address the House today for 10 minutes following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ASSIGNMENT OF TRAINEES TO HAWAII

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a letter from one of my constituents in regard to our trainees assigned to Hawaii. The letter in part reads as follows:

I am the mother of a boy who is in Hawaii for basic training. He is our only child and I needn't tell you how important it is both for him and for us for him to be able to come home on leave before he is assigned probably to the Far East. It seems to me that the least the Army could do is to transport these boys home without cost to them for their short leave. I don't think it is necessary to go into detail about the importance of morale of both parents and boys in cases like mine. In order for us to bring him home we would have to give up a lifetime of savings, and I am sure there are many, many families in the same position as we.

It is therefore my hope that you will be able to do something for me in this connection.

I will appreciate any help you can give.

Respectfully yours.

Mr. Speaker, investigation reveals that many of our boys from the East are in the same plight as a result of an error of judgment on the part of the War Department officials. I, myself, have received 30 protests from people in my district. While the War Department officials state there was no discrimination in the assignments of trainees to Hawaii, they do admit that the situation needs correction. They also admit that the policy has placed a great financial hardship on the families of the boys from the east coast who had to use part of their life savings for the opportunity of bidding Godspeed to their sons leaving for foreign assignments. I have been told that the granting of a 7-day furlough to the boys is a policy inaugurated by the War Department to help bolster the morale of not only the families, but also the inductees. The Department states that there is no requirement of law compelling them to do so. Yet in following out the policy they did not anticipate the financial burden of an outlay of approximately \$700—a mighty big sum to pay for the opportunity of spending 7 days with their sons prior to overseas duty. I am told that authority to send boys out of continental United States stems from the lack of prohibitory language in Public Law 51, which we passed last July. Since training facilities were available in Hawaii and since the use of those facilities was more economical than opening new posts in the United States the Defense Department anticipated no difficulty in sending the boys there from all parts of the United States.

In this connection I am told that a sizable portion of the quotas sent to Hawaii from different parts of this country are volunteers for this training. Men are sent to Korea from Hawaii in the same ratio as from posts in the United States. Those who come back to this country for additional training or those

who go to Europe, of course, get the same advantages for leave as men who are trained at posts within the continental limits of the United States. The real problem lies in the cases of those who go to Hawaii involuntarily and then are sent to the Far East. In all fairness I can say that the Army is now working to correct this injustice in the future, but I understand, can do nothing about the past. Since the deluge of protests—I understand some three hundred have been filed—the Department of Defense has realized its error and I am told that hereafter it will assign only boys from the West to Hawaii.

But what about the parents of the boys who have suffered because of this error? Is there no redress? The Department of Defense can in no way reimburse them for the money expended. In my opinion it was never the intent of the Members who voted for Public Law 51 to impose such hardships upon any inductees whatsoever, and I ask the members of the appropriate committees to give consideration to a plan of reimbursement. I trust the Congress will enact legislation to correct this injustice. This added financial burden is more than the families of the inductees should be asked to bear.

TELEVISION AND BROADCASTING CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am causing a letter to be sent to every Member of the House inviting signatures on discharge petition No. 3, which relates to House Resolution 62, expressing the will of the House as to televising and broadcasting of important congressional proceedings and giving the Speaker the power of selection and administration within that policy.

Mr. Speaker, I had an extended statement on this subject in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, which goes into the questions raised by the Speaker's action in finding that no further television or radio broadcasting of committee proceedings could take place, which brings this whole question to the front.

I think the time has come to solve the fundamental question, and my resolution, I feel, deals with the fundamental question of the will of the House as to televising and broadcasting of important congressional proceedings with the confidence that once that will is expressed the Speaker will exercise the power granted with great ability and fairness.

The distinction made between debates on the floor and committee proceedings involves the question of the rights of an individual as a witness and there a code of fair procedures and the exercise of a wise discretion to preserve fairness in handling witnesses and in other arrangements, under the Speaker's general supervision, should be adequate safeguards.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

TELEVISION OF HOUSE COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution to amend the rules of the House so as to authorize House committees to allow their hearings to be televised.

Monday, February 25, in response to a parliamentary inquiry by Minority Leader JOE MARTIN, Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN ruled that proceedings of House committees could not be televised. This ruling came about in connection with the hearings of the Un-American Activities Committee held in Detroit this week.

Recognizing that the question may be a close one, I interpret the rules otherwise than the Speaker did. I call attention to the provision of the Legislative Reorganization Act which orders all hearings to be public unless the committee—by majority vote—decides they should be executive. This is section 133 (f) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and reads as follows:

All hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public, except executive sessions for marking up bills or for voting or where the committee by a majority vote orders an executive session.

This would seem to me to mean that any citizen has a right to be present at committee public hearings. It also seems to me this rule would include the press, radio, news reels, and television. If any citizen has a right to be present in person, why should he be denied attendance through television or broadcasting?

I also call attention to the fact that there is nothing in the rules of the House of Representatives or in the Legislative Reorganization Act which expressly prohibits the telecasting of proceedings of the House of Representatives or its committees.

Mystery surrounds the origin of this move to prevent Michigan citizens from personally witnessing the inquiry into Communist influences in Michigan.

According to reports, Speaker RAYBURN acknowledged to the press that he had received a call from Detroit regarding the telecast of the Un-American Activities hearings but refused to disclose the name of the caller.

Obviously reasons and advantages to the Democratic Party which would result from suppressing the possible disclosures of Communist activity in Michigan have led commentators and the press and radio generally to speculate on the motives of those who apparently urged Speaker RAYBURN to act.

It is suggested that they feared influential officials in Democratic Party circles would be shown to have a sympathetic leaning toward Communist principles, objectives, and activities. It is also suggested that Michigan's Republican member of the Un-American Activities Committee, Representative CHARLES E. POTTER, of Cheboygan, might gain prestige and acclaim through the committee's work. Representative POTTER is frequently mentioned as a possible candidate to oppose the incumbent Democratic Senator from Michigan.

I myself hesitate to accept these charges. I certainly reject them with respect to the decision by Speaker RAYBURN. I believe the record will fully substantiate his statement that he has consistently sought to prevent telecasting of committee hearings whenever he has learned of it. I also am completely satisfied that the Speaker's ruling proceeded from a sincere interpretation of the rules.

Believing this, it seems to me that to prevent injustice and to curb the speculation as to motives which has sprung up, the mystery should be dispelled and clarity should prevail. If the call from Detroit did not urge suppression of the telecasting for political advantage, the public is entitled to know it.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to commend the gentleman for stating that he did not have any feeling that the Speaker had any ulterior motive in regard to the hearings that are now being held in Detroit. Over a week ago, long before the Detroit hearings, the Speaker mentioned to me, as chairman of the Committee Investigating the Polish Massacres at Katyn, that we would not be allowed to televise our hearings. So I am satisfied that the Speaker's ban had nothing whatsoever to do with the situation in Detroit, because of the fact that he had spoken to me about my committee's hearings long before the hearings in Detroit.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman. I was aware of a conference which the Katyn Massacre Committee had with the Speaker, and I understood that he had opposed the televising of certain hearings, which the committee planned to hold in Chicago, although as I recall it, the gentleman from Indiana did have television at the hearings here in Washington where the committee heard witnesses on the Katyn Massacre.

Mr. MADDEN. That is right. But, that was 3 weeks ago, and the Speaker of the House called my attention to the rules of the House. That might have been 10 days ago so the ruling of the Speaker could not have anything to do whatsoever with the present hearings in Detroit.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very glad to see the gentleman entering into this situation. I do not wish to express a judgment with respect to the political mo-

tives involved. We all love the Speaker, and I use that term advisedly. That is something the gentleman himself will deal with. I am interested though in the major question. I want to compliment the gentleman on his taking the cudgels for opening the doors for committee hearings, and I hope the gentleman will extend his view to the important debates of the Congress. I would like, Mr. Speaker, if I may, to ask the gentleman two questions. First: Does not the gentleman feel that the public has its right to have modern science expand the walls of this Chamber so that they can see and hear on the television and the radio the important debates of this body?

Mr. MEADER. I would like to make a distinction, as I will later on in my remarks, between the hearings of the committees and the proceedings in the Chamber itself. I believe the Speaker of the House now has authority, if he so desires, to permit the televising of the proceedings of the House, and he has permitted proceedings in the House Chamber to be televised in the past, as I point out in my remarks. I would like to withhold any further comment on the use of television in the House Chamber proceedings, as is contained in the gentleman's resolution, until a little later, if I may.

Mr. JAVITS. Surely.

Mr. MEADER. Because I do discuss that and draw some distinction between committee hearings and the debates in the House Chamber.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman, and may I ask him this further question which relates to a specific point, and that is: Does not the gentleman feel that if his resolution should carry and the will of the House should be expressed that committee hearings can be opened up to television and radio, it would be necessary to promulgate a code for the protection of witnesses, and although I do not know if the gentleman is a lawyer, although I believe he is, that it is very essential to protect witnesses, and that the indiscriminate use of television and radio could very easily in many cases work out to invade individual rights?

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman is correct. I am an attorney. In fact, I have had a little experience with congressional committees, having served as assistant counsel for the Truman committee and chief counsel to the Mead committee, and chief counsel to the Fulbright committee. Based upon that experience, I have some misgivings about proposals for a code of conduct for committee procedure. I do not believe it is desirable for congressional committees to attempt to set up anything like the rigid rules of evidence governing procedure in the courts. I have written two law review articles on that subject. One in the Michigan Law Review for April of 1948, I believe, and then a subsequent article last Spring for a symposium of the Chicago Law Review. My views are fully expressed in those articles. But, I do not believe that is pertinent to this discussion except in this way, that it is my belief that the committees should control their procedure including the means of dissemination of news of their proceedings.

Mr. JAVITS. In other words, the gentleman would rely upon the committee over which the Member is presiding to use its discretion as to the extent to which the witness needs protection of his individual rights?

Mr. MEADER. I would have some faith in the good judgment of the members of the committee, and I rather resent the frequent implication in the press that all Congressmen and Senators are irresponsible.

Mr. JAVITS. I never had in mind any code which would prescribe legal rules of evidence. That would obviously invalidate many wonderful congressional investigations, and make impossible the obtaining of statements from witnesses. But does not the gentleman feel we should erect some guideposts for the committees? For example, if a witness is obviously unable to be at ease or to do himself justice under the probing of the television camera, and if it should appear in a particular case that charges are made which are entitled to refutation, charges which receive very, very wide currency over the television and radio, that then an opportunity should be afforded in some fashion to refute those charges by those whom they are made against.

Mr. MEADER. Let me answer that question by saying I believe fairness is always a measure of the prestige and dignity and effectiveness of any committee. The press and the people are very sensitive to overreaching, browbeating of witnesses, and unfair treatment on the part of congressional committees. I do not know how you are going to reform human beings. If you entrust power to them, they always have the opportunity of abusing that power. I do not know of any rigid code of conduct that can be enforced upon congressional committees which would prevent any possible abuses without also preventing the committee from doing any good.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not want to take any more of the gentleman's time, except to advise the gentleman that both in the other body and here various Members have proposed such a code. I hope the gentleman will study them in connection with his resolution.

Mr. MEADER. Yes. I have. One of my articles in the Law Review dealt with a proposal made by Senator Lucas, made some time ago, and I attempted to analyze the effect of the rules he proposed upon the conduct of committee proceedings.

If the call from Detroit did urge consideration of political strategy, the public should also know that. The identification of the caller, preferably by the caller's disclosing himself, would remove suspicion which now surrounds others who might benefit from the suppression of telecasting of the hearings. It is no more than fair to them that the inferences and innuendo proceeding from the anonymity of the caller be removed.

Speaker RAYBURN's ruling, whether right or wrong, serves to bring to the attention of the public and the Congress, in a forceful way, the basic issue of telecasting of congressional proceedings. This issue should be thoroughly considered in all of its phases and implications. The broadcasting and television industry

should be heard; the general public should be heard, and—after thorough consideration—a congressional policy should be announced. It is for this reason that I have introduced the resolution which would authorize committees—in their discretion—to control the media of communication in the dissemination of news of their proceedings to the general public.

The executive committee of the Radio Correspondents' Galleries yesterday expressed their views on the reporting of congressional activities, which presents briefly the position of the affected industries.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of the radio correspondents to the Speaker of the House be included at this point in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAVENNER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(The letter is as follows:)

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,

The Speaker, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The undersigned members of the executive committee of the Radio Correspondents' galleries offer herewith our respectful but deep-felt dissent from your interpretation of the House rule so as to exclude radio, radio recording, television, and television newsreel cameras from sessions of House committees.

We feel strongly that this is discrimination against two of the major media for news dissemination. Newspapermen cover committee sessions with pencils and copy paper. We use the microphone, the camera, tape recordings, and film. Your ruling deprives us of the full use of the tools of our trade.

We submit that radio and television reporting is the most accurate possible. We use excerpts of actual questions by committee members and answers by witnesses. These reach millions of American listeners and viewers not only in actual voice, but in the exact phrasing as official as the printed committee record. Daily newspaper circulation amounts to 54,000,000. Presently there are over 105,000,000 radio sets and more than 15,000,000 television sets in use throughout the country. This is the size of the audience deprived by your decision of full access to the news developed by your committees.

As this committee has noted before we feel a matter of principle is involved in this question of full radio and television coverage of committee hearings. This principle we would define as one of full as opposed to limited reportage. While we have noted above that we feel we are being discriminated against by not being permitted the full use of the tools of our trade, we also respectfully submit that in retrospect it is easily demonstrable that the constitutional rights of witnesses before congressional committees are better protected by full radio and television coverage than by the traditional kind of press coverage. There is no intention to be derogatory about press coverage in noting that unavoidable limitations of space in even the largest newspapers make it impossible for newspaper reporters to provide more than a précis of any witness' testimony before a congressional committee.

We respectfully submit that it is the fundamental function of all reporters, no matter what media they employ, to inform the public fully on matters of public concern, and we maintain that full radio and television coverage need not interfere with the orderly procedure of committee hearings.

We feel, Mr. Speaker, that our concept of our job as we have outlined it above need not conflict in any way with your concept of the dignity of the House of Represent-

atives. We are certain that these two concepts are reconcilable, and we would appreciate an opportunity to sit down with you in the quiet of your office to talk over what we regard as a definite handicap in our covering of committee proceedings.

Respectfully,

Executive Committee of Correspondents:
Charles Shutt, Member at Large; Howard L. Kany, Member at Large; Rudolph Block, Member at Large; Willard F. Shadel, Member Ex Officio; Hollis M. Seavey, Chairman; Martin Agronsky, Vice Chairman; Joseph C. Harsch, Secretary; Richard Harkness, Treasurer.

Mr. MEADER. Apparently the ruling of the Speaker on Monday banning telecasting of the Detroit hearings of the Un-American Activities Committee is the first time this precise parliamentary question has been raised in the House itself.

However, as we all know, live telecasting, retelecasting, live broadcasting, and rebroadcasting and news-reel photography have been permitted extensively by committees and subcommittees of both the House and the Senate, without effective objection.

I am having prepared a comprehensive and accurate list of the reporting of congressional committee hearings, in which I understand the practice is just as old as the television industry itself. I propose to show, if possible, in this list the name of the committee holding the hearings, the date, the subject matter and the particular media of communication through which the accounts of its proceedings were reported. When such a list is compiled, I will insert it in the RECORD for the information of the Congress.

I believe this compilation will reveal that the telecasting and broadcasting of hearings has been so extensive over such a long period of time and without effective objection that it may fairly be said that a practice and custom has grown up which should be treated as having the same validity as an express rule of the House of Representatives.

I believe a distinction can appropriately be drawn between committee proceedings and proceedings in the Chamber of the House itself with respect to the telecasting of debates, events and activities. However, I do think it is pertinent that the House has frequently permitted telecasting of its proceedings. Joint sessions of the Congress, to receive messages from the President or foreign notables such as Prime Minister Winston Churchill, have uniformly been telecast and broadcast. Moreover, the separate sessions of the House of Representatives have also been televised. The opening days of both the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congress were reported by live telecast. The opening session of the Eighty-second Congress was recorded and filmed and retelecast.

Over a period of time I have given considerable thought to the arguments pro and con on committee procedure, including the publicity attendant upon committee hearings.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Again I do not want to take any of the gentleman's time, but

do I infer that the gentleman would favor the televising and broadcasting of important House debates? I know that has never been done; the Speaker has never permitted it, and from his expressions recently he would not permit it unless the House exclusively authorized it.

By important debate I mean, for instance, such as that which will come up on Monday and Tuesday of next week when we will be amending the UMT bill which is vital to the American people. Does not the gentleman feel about that as he does about committee procedures? But this debate emphasizes the importance manifold in terms of critical importance to the people in seeing just what takes place on the floor of Congress.

Mr. MEADER. My inclination is to go along with the gentleman on that. I think there are a lot of questions that could be raised, but I feel, as the gentleman will see from my further remarks, that the benefit of bringing the Government closer to the people and informing them more completely on public affairs is in the public interest, because our people in this country are the ultimate sovereigns and they can only exercise their responsibility and their authority intelligently if they are informed. Televising and broadcasting and other means of reporting to the people things that occur in their National Government is in the interest of a better informed citizenry, and would result in better government.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. MEADER. My approach to this question stems from my firm conviction that the great need of the country today is to strengthen the Congress. I believe firmly in democratic processes and in the determination of national policy through representatives elected and controlled by the people. I am likewise convinced that in the past two or three decades there has been a great gravitation of governmental power into the bureaus, departments, and agencies of the executive branch of the Government. I am further convinced that this trend is not in the interest of government by the people but, on the contrary, is in the direction of totalitarianism, where the executive branch controls the affairs of a nation to the exclusion of the judicial and legislative branches of the Government.

Fascism and communism are, in essence, overgrown bureaucracies where government officials are the masters of the people, not their servants.

The founders of our Constitution displayed outstanding foresight and wisdom in setting up the structure of our Government so as to provide for the separation of governmental powers. The checks and balances they created were designed to prevent tyranny.

Elsewhere, in congressional debates, in speeches and in law review articles, I have outlined at some length my views that the Congress has lost control in a large measure of its policy-making authority and even of its appropriating power. I have urged the Congress to streamline, modernize, and strengthen itself to discharge more adequately its

constitutional responsibilities. I have suggested that this could be done effectively by staffing congressional committees with competent, able, and patriotic investigative talent, loyal to the Congress itself. I have pointed out that Congress under present-day conditions is dealing with complex, intricate economic, and social problems. It is attempting to solve these problems, in a sense, with its bare hands; Congress cannot hope to deal intelligently with these difficult problems unless, by the use of an investigative instrument it penetrates beneath the surface generalities of a subject and reaches the bedrock of fact.

When national policies and programs come to be based upon fact and logic instead of prejudices and emotions, the democratic system of government will have proved itself workable.

It is in this light that it seems to me that dissemination of news concerning the activities of congressional committees assumes transcendent importance. In a democracy, the people, who are the ultimate sovereigns, cannot act intelligently unless they are informed. It would not be in the public interest for an iron curtain to be drawn between the people and their representatives. The more the people know about their government, the more likely they are to base their decisions at the polls on sound facts and arguments rather than on emotions and prejudices.

I know of no public official who would seriously advocate, or dare to advocate, that the operations of the Government should be hidden from the people. Why, then, should there be opposition to the use of television and radio broadcasting as a means of accurately and vividly presenting to the American public exactly what transpires in the national arena?

Newspaper reporters, news cameramen taking still pictures, radio commentators, movie cameras, tape recording and telecasting are the agencies through which happenings are brought to the public. For the life of me I have difficulty in distinguishing between these news agencies on any rational, legal, or functional basis.

The only thing unique about television is that it is, perhaps, the most effective form of transmission of news, because it utilizes both the senses of sight and hearing. One viewing television is personally present at the event. Indeed, because of the poor acoustics and arrangement of some of our committee rooms, the person viewing committee hearings on television may have a much better and clearer view of the proceedings than spectators personally present in the hearing room. Furthermore, it is difficult, if not impossible except by editing, to distort television or radio broadcasting of the proceedings themselves. In a sense, they are a primary record. No better evidence of what happened could be obtained.

The argument is used that televising congressional proceedings would tend to encourage showmanship on the part of legislators. To me, this argument is not a valid one. The 531 Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate constitute the board of directors of

the greatest institution on the face of the earth. For the most part, these men and women are patriotic public servants. At the very least, they are a cross section of the American people; if their quality is inferior, it is only because the people of the country have permitted it to be so. Whatever tendency there is for demagogery in the Congress exists whether the proceedings are televised or not.

It would seem to me that the actual witnessing of the conduct of the Congress by the people would have a tendency rather to encourage Representatives and Senators to be more statesmanlike, if that is really what the people want in their representatives.

The voters and the media of communication have a way of taking care of persons who would do anything to get publicity regardless of its effect upon the welfare of the country. The only thing that television would do would be to throw the spotlight on public activities and public events. I cannot believe that this would be harmful if we take as our basic premise that government by the people is desirable.

Television is one of man's miracles which can have great impact on our society in the future. In the political field it can serve to bring Government closer to the people. It seems to me all citizens who have lost any yearning to go back to the horse-and-buggy days will welcome this new instrument of our modern age. It may well prove to be a valuable tool in reversing the trend toward bureaucracy and restoring policymaking power to the Congress where it rightfully belongs.

I am firmly convinced that the people will take action to strengthen their Congress and, thus, to preserve and promote the cause of democracy if the people are fully and accurately informed on national affairs. I believe the telecasting and broadcasting of congressional proceedings is an effective way of providing the people with that information.

I, therefore, am convinced that authorizing congressional committees to decide what type of publicity will be permitted concerning their proceedings is in the public interest.

Resolved, That rule XI (2) (f) of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) The rules of the House are hereby made the rules of its standing committees and its select and special committees, so far as applicable, with the following exceptions: "(A) A motion to recess from day to day is hereby made a motion of high privilege in such committees;

"(B) Each committee, and each subcommittee thereof, is authorized to fix a lesser number than a majority of its entire membership which shall constitute a quorum thereof for the purpose of taking sworn testimony: *Provided*, That any such quorum of less than a majority of its entire membership shall consist of not less than one member of the majority party and one member of the minority party;

"(C) Each committee, and each subcommittee thereof, is authorized, in its discretion, to permit the dissemination of news of its proceedings, during such proceedings or thereafter, by radio and television, and by such other methods and media of communication, and upon such terms and conditions, as it deems advisable."

(Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a copy of a resolution he has introduced.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I did not want to interrupt the gentleman too much while he was speaking. I think the gentleman has stated the argument in favor of televising and broadcasting important congressional proceedings very well. I certainly welcome him into this fight because I think it is very much in the interest of the American people. I would like to say something to the gentleman, however. I have been at this a little over a year now and I must say that there are a lot of Republicans that need to be convinced and I hope that the gentleman, now that he is in it, will go about that task which I have been trying to do almost alone.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I suggest that the matter has not been brought to a head before because the committee have uniformly and at will, it seemed to me, gone ahead and reported their hearings as they saw fit and have permitted different reporting agencies as they thought appropriate to cover their hearings. But the ruling made by the Speaker, which is the first ruling in the House of Representatives on this specific subject, as I understand it from the Parliamentarian, has brought this matter to the fore. I was very gratified to note the attitude of the Speaker, that if the rules of the House were to be changed he, of course, would abide by the rules of the House. The Speaker indicated it was a matter that should be considered by the Rules Committee, and I urge that the Rules Committee take action. I was astonished by the comments in the press today that some Rules Committee members have made up their minds already. I hope those accounts did not accurately report their views.

Mr. JAVITS. May I say to the gentleman that I was before the Committee on Rules on this very proposition, I think in April of last year, and the reception was not very enthusiastic, but I do not believe that is universally true of the Committee on Rules. Let us hope that with a number of other hands working we can get better results.

Mr. MEADER. I only want to point out to the gentleman again, as I have before, that the telecasting of the debates in the House of Representatives, in my judgment, is a somewhat different problem from the proceedings of the committees. I base that view primarily on this theory. As I understand the philosophy of the rules of the House, the Speaker is a very powerful influence upon what happens in the Chamber of the House. He now, as I understand it, has the discretion to allow or not to allow the telecasting of proceedings here. In his discretion he has decided not to allow the debates to be broadcast and televised, but with his permission joint sessions or joint meetings of the Congress can be and have been televised. Now,

that is a discretionary matter. All I am seeking to do, which is somewhat different from the gentleman's resolution, is to give to the committees of the Congress the same authority that the Speaker now has with respect to the Chamber, namely, in their discretion to control the media of communication by which their proceedings are reported.

Mr. JAVITS. Obviously, if the House does not express itself on the fundamental issue, the Speaker is not going to permit it either for committees or in the Chamber. That is my point.

Mr. MEADER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. I merely want to correct the impression that the gentleman gave when he made the statement that the ruling Monday by the Speaker was the first ruling against television in committees, because about 10 days ago he advised me, as chairman of the Special Committee Investigating the Katyn Massacre, that we could not televise any more. The Detroit hearings were 10 days later. I received the ruling 10 days ago.

Mr. MEADER. I did not mean to say that that was the first time the Speaker expressed himself against it. What I meant to make clear and will emphasize again is that so far as I could learn from the Parliamentarian this was the first time that a parliamentary inquiry on the question had been presented and was passed upon by the Speaker in a formal ruling, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I understand, and I think I stated in my remarks when the gentleman interrupted me before, that the Speaker has consistently, when he learned about it, expressed his disapproval of the telecasting of committee hearings.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. He expressed his views that it violated the rules of the House; that was simply what he ruled the other day in response to the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MEADER. I believe that modification is correct, in the light of my statement. I was not personally present when he made the statement, so I do not know what he said.

Mr. McCORMACK. His approval is one thing; his interpretation of the rules as the Speaker is another thing. The gentleman recognizes that distinction.

Mr. MEADER. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is why the word "approval" might appear to a reader of the RECORD that it was purely discretionary with the Speaker as to whether or not committees could be televised when, as a matter of fact, in accordance with his construction of the rules of the House as presently constituted, with which I am in complete agreement, television is not permitted, not only in the House but in committees of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MEADER. That raises a question I would like to ask the distinguished majority leader. I may have been misinformed. Is it not true that telecasting of proceedings of the House has been permitted, and is that not discretionary with the Speaker under the rules?

Mr. McCORMACK. The Speaker has, under the rules, certain discretionary power which he has properly limited in the absence of any change of the rules by the House itself. The question of what should be done and what the House wants to do is separate and distinct from the Speaker's ruling. To my recollection this is the first time the matter has been raised by a parliamentary inquiry. So far as I know, whenever the Speaker has received information that any committee is televising or acting contrary to the rules, he has so instructed the chairman of the committee or the subcommittee.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

SABOTAGING THE WAGE STABILIZATION BOARD

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 532, introduced on February 22, calls for an investigation of the Wage Stabilization Board by the House Committee on Education and Labor. I want to serve notice that as a member of the Rules Committee to which this resolution has been referred I shall oppose it. The Wage Stabilization Board must be free to arrive at decisions based on fact, without coercion or intimidation from any source—including the Congress of the United States.

The purpose of the resolution is crystal clear. It is intended as a congressional club to be used against the Wage Stabilization Board on the union-shop issue now pending before the Board in the steel wage case. It seeks to use the Congress of the United States as an ally of the National Association of Manufacturers, the Committee for Constitutional Government, and the barons of the steel industry in their current high-financed, Nation-wide propaganda campaign directed against a possible recommendation for the union shop by the Wage Stabilization Board. In my opinion the resolution calls for unjustifiable, prejudicial interference by Congress in the decision-making authority of the Board.

The very timing of the introduction of the resolution stigmatizes it as an attempt at undue influence on the Wage Stabilization Board in the first major dispute case to come before it. It will be recalled that on January 10 of this year a special panel of the Wage Stabilization Board began hearings on the dis-

pute case between the major steel-producing companies and the United Steelworkers of America. Those hearings were concluded on February 16. Six days later—I repeat and emphasize this because it is of the utmost importance—6 days later, on February 22, a resolution is introduced in this House calling for an investigation of the Wage Stabilization Board.

What is the basis for the investigation? In the words of the resolution itself, to determine whether the Board has exceeded its authority and jurisdiction with respect to labor disputes, to determine whether the Board has failed to respect the national labor policy as expressed in the Labor-Management Relations Act, the Defense Production Act, and other applicable laws with regard to collective bargaining. There is no excuse for congressional time and money being wasted on prejudicial investigations designed to influence and harass Government agencies in the administration of their lawful duties.

Legitimate investigations by committees of Congress of Government agencies or personnel based on specific charges of corruption, fraud, or maladministration are, of course, always in order, and I would not be one to oppose such investigations. I do object, however, vigorously and emphatically when this House is called upon to approve an investigation by one of its committees of an agency of the Government where the obvious purpose of such investigation is made at a time when the welfare and well-being of hundreds of thousands of American workers and their families are involved in a major case currently pending before that agency.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Does not the distinguished gentleman from Indiana think that when the House turned down the Lucas amendment in the last session of the Congress they gave an answer to that question?

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman is entirely correct.

You will recall that last year when this body had under consideration amendment of the Defense Production Act, an attempt was made through the Lucas amendment to take away from the Wage Stabilization Board its powers to handle nonwage dispute cases. After full debate on the matter this House took decisive action by a vote of 217 to 113 to reject the Lucas proposal. It was recognized at that time by the Members of this House, and rightly so, that more than the oppressive provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act were needed for the settlement of disputes in critical defense industries. The President of the United States likewise recognized that fact in assigning dispute functions to the Board under his constitutional powers. No one can successfully challenge the correctness of the decision made by this House or of the action taken by the President with respect to the dispute authority of the Board.

Nor can anyone in good faith contend that a union shop recommendation by the Wage Stabilization Board would be a violation of national labor policy as expressed in the Labor-Management Relations Act, the Defense Production Act, or any other applicable law pertaining to collective bargaining. Is anyone's memory so short as not to remember that just last year this Congress—by unanimous vote of the Senate and by a vote of 307 to 18 of this House—amended the Taft-Hartley Act by eliminating the need for elections to authorize a union shop? The union shop in American industry is not a violation of national labor policy, and no one knows that better than the proponents of House Resolution 532.

The leaders and members of the United Steelworkers of America are to be highly commended for the patience and forbearance they have shown in their dispute with the major steel producing companies of the Nation. In their month-long series of conferences between mid-November and mid-December with representatives of the steel industry they were unable to receive any counter-proposals from the industry in response to their own proposals for improvement of the collective bargaining contracts. "No" was the one and only answer given by the industry to each of the union's proposals.

In patriotic recognition of the needs of the defense program the union postponed a scheduled strike to enable the dispute to be heard and considered by the Wage Stabilization Board. Just last week the union again set back the strike date until midnight of March 23 in order that the Board might have ample time for full consideration of the issues and evidence presented in the hearings which ended on February 16.

All this has been done by the union despite the campaign of vilification conducted against it by the steel industry and its cohorts. All this despite the weeks and months of conferences and hearings. All this despite the overwhelming sentiment for the union shop among steelworkers as expressed by them in a truly American and democratic way—through the secret ballot. All this despite their firm insistence on acceptance of their proposals by the steel industry as expressed in open special convention held on January 3 and 4 of this year. All this despite the continued response of "No" given to the union proposals by representatives of the steel industry in the Wage Stabilization Board hearings.

It ill behooves this House to inject itself at this time into the steel-dispute case on the side of the steel industry. And that is exactly what we would be doing were we to approve House Resolution 532 and thereby authorize an investigation of the Wage Stabilization Board.

I call upon all fair-minded Members of this House to join me in vigorous and outspoken opposition to this resolution in order that the Wage Stabilization Board may arrive at a decision in the Steel case based on facts; a decision completely free from coercion or intimidation by the Congress of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CONSUMERS BEWARE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, American consumers are about to be submitted to one of the biggest scale drives against their pocketbooks, which the country has yet seen. The campaign is designed to accomplish nothing less than repeal of all price controls, this despite the accumulated evidence that the price-control law is essential, and the fact that in the current report by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the first time in 5 months, the consumers price index has not shown a price increase. This campaign is signalled by a meeting to be held tomorrow morning at 10 a. m. at the Hotel Sherman in Chicago called by the Corn Belt Livestock Feeders Association of that city with the objective of organizing a big campaign, and I quote their words "eliminating the OPS," from their letter calling for the meeting. This organization says frankly, and I quote:

Our association wants to get rid of OPS and price control.

Addressing a number of the major organizations of food producers and distributors in the country, the call for the meeting also says:

Your association wants to get rid of the OPS and price control.

Another disquieting feature of this proposed drive is the statement contained in the association's call for the meeting:

This will be a confidential meeting without publicity.

Those invited are exhorted in the following words:

And please come prepared for action.

The speakers on the tentative program at the conference make up an impressive list of trade association officials concerned with producing and distributing of important items in the Nation's diet, and in the ordinary family's budget.

The Corn Belt Livestock Producers Association certainly has a right to organize a campaign to repeal the OPS and price controls although I think the idea of a confidential campaign is ill-advised. But consumers certainly should be alerted so that they in their massive, but unfortunately unorganized way, can be sure that their Representatives in Congress understand what they want and what they need for their own economic protection.

I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 194 on January 28 to establish a joint congressional committee for the protection of consumers to meet just such a threat as is here posed for consumers by the activities of the Corn Belt Livestock Feeders Association.

Other points that consumers should know particularly, too, are that the meat producers who are supposedly in this association, and others to whom it has appealed, have enjoyed a preferential standing under the price-control law—not being subject to controls unless their products reach 100 percent of a very

favorable parity price formula; that meat is the highest priced item in the family diet; and that the Department of Agriculture estimates the cattle feeders to be making a profit of \$35 a head as against a 10 year average profit of \$23 a head. The same meat producers were very important in the drive of defeating the provision authorizing slaughter quotas when wage and price control legislation was last before the Congress, and Members who have spoken to me about it have since been doubtful as to whether this was the right thing to do in view of the continuing high cost of meat.

Mr. Speaker, it is for these reasons, which I have just described, without in any way trying to stop or interfere with any American or group of Americans from running any campaign they want to, though I do think that as large associations they ought to tell the American public about it, that I have called it specifically to the attention of consumers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to—

Mr. LANE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Alabama and to include an editorial.

Mr. PRICE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GORDON and to include a letter that he received from a constituent.

Mr. FISHER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWABE in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana and to include a petition from his constituents and his reply.

Mr. ANGELL in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POULSON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ADAIR and to include newspaper articles.

Mr. BAKEWELL in two instances and to include editorials appearing in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

Mr. BUTLER.

Mr. BRAMELETT and to include an address delivered by Mr. PHILLIPS entitled "Moses Was a Republican."

Mr. JAVITS.

Mr. HILLINGS and to include a resolution.

Mr. NORELAD in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MITCHELL in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FALLON (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include a resolution.

Mr. ALBERT and to include a speech by Hon. Paul Walker.

Mr. LESINSKI and to include an article appearing in Reader's Digest.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of New York (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) in three instances and to include editorials.

Mr. GWINN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HINSHAW and to include a clipping appearing in the Moline Register.

Mr. REED of New York in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD in five instances.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include a magazine article.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HESS (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 28, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1200. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the activities authorized by Public Law 763, Eighty-first Congress, pertaining to war-risk insurance, for the period ending December 31, 1951; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1201. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners of the Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 2458. An act to correct a typographical error in Public Law 204, Eighty-second Congress, relating to assistant superintendents in the Motor Vehicle Service of the Post Office Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 1428). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4285. A bill to reserve certain land on the public domain in Nevada for addition to the Summit Lake Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1429). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4694. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the Gallup-

Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navajo Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1430). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5489. A bill to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Malta irrigation district and the Glasgow irrigation district, to authorize their execution by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1431). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5630. A bill to approve a repayment contract negotiated with the Frenchtown irrigation district, Montana, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1432). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6133. A bill to authorize a \$100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; with amendment (Rept. No. 1433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REDDEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6242. A bill to restore certain land to the Territory of Hawaii and to authorize said Territory to exchange the whole or a portion of the same; with amendment (Rept. No. 1434). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6675. A bill to authorize the conveyance of lands in the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation to the State of California or to the Hoopa unified school district for use for school purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1435). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REDDEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4410. A bill to amend section 16 of the Hawaiian Organic Act relative to disqualification of legislators; with amendment (Rept. No. 1436). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PRIEST: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5767. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements which establish minimum resale prices and which are extended by State law to nonsigners; with amendment (Rept. No. 1437). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1447. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1448. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6561. A bill for the relief of Monika Waltraud Fecht; without amendment (Rept. No. 1446). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 836. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harumi China Cairns and George Thomas Cairns, with amendment (Rept. No. 1438).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3534. A bill for the relief of Gabriella Rubido Zichy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1439). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4343. A bill for the relief of Erika Bammes (Patricia Ann Cox); without amendment (Rept. No. 1440). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5920. A bill for the relief of Kimberly Ann Cibulski, also known as Belle Lee; with amendment (Rept. No. 1441). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6055. A bill for the relief of Anne de Ballet-Latour; without amendment (Rept. No. 1442). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6088. A bill for the relief of Hisako Suzuki; without amendment (Rept. No. 1443). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6117. A bill for the relief of Deliana Meulenkamp; with amendment (Rept. No. 1444). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6480. A bill for the relief of Elaine Irving Hedley; without amendment (Rept. No. 1445). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 6816. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to prescribe circumstances under which the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance system may be extended to State and local employees who are covered by retirement systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES:

H. R. 6817. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to prescribe circumstances under which the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance system may be extended to State and local employees who are covered by retirement systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 6818. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 6819. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 6820. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the \$50 work clause shall not apply in respect of work performed by individuals who have attained the age of 70; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 6821. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired prior to April 1, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 6822. A bill to amend section 12 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 6823. A bill providing for the construction of a highway, and appurtenances

thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 6824. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that individuals may deduct from gross income expenses paid or incurred for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 6825. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to require that every ship subject to the provisions of part II of title III of such act, carry suitable radio equipment for all lifeboats; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. J. Res. 393. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. J. Res. 394. Joint resolution to provide for the quartering, in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia, of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies of 1953; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. J. Res. 395. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the presidential inaugural ceremonies of 1953; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. Res. 538. Resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives relative to broadcasts of committee hearings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. Res. 539. Resolution amending House Resolution 390, which provides for an investigation and study of the Katyn Forest massacre; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MEADER:

H. Res. 540. Resolution amending rule XI (2) (f) of the Rules of the House of Representatives to authorize committees to establish a quorum of less than a majority for the purpose of taking sworn testimony, and to regulate the dissemination of news of their proceedings; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. Res. 541. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of offensive and undesirable books and radio and television programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 542. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 505, part 1, Eighty-second Congress, first session; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to House Joint Resolutions Nos. 32 and 7 respectively, in regard to the maximum income tax rates, and the proposing of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 10, providing for the repeal of the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for the adoption of the twenty-second amendment thereto, relating to limiting the rates of taxes on incomes, gifts, inheritances, and estates to 25 percent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 6826. A bill for the relief of the Lake States Engineering Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 6827. A bill for the relief of Edith Mathis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 6828. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Scavone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. R. 6829. A bill for the relief of Antonio Fazio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 6830. A bill for the relief of Martha Farah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE (by request):

H. R. 6831. A bill for the relief of Francisco Albino-Martinha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 6832. A bill for the relief of Irving Polonoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 6833. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nike Varga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6834. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Antonio Valenti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 6835. A bill for the relief of Nicholas M. Papadopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 6836. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mary Youn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

597. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mrs. Arthur L. Bliss, Washington, D. C., relative to a grievance involving illegal eviction, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, February 25, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate pastor, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God our Father, who art filled with compassion and tender mercy toward us, we thank Thee that each day is a new beginning. In its possibilities we revel, for its potential blessings we see the benefits of Thy hand. Throughout its hours may we think with diligence and act with dispatch that, whatever may come of bane or blessing, we may be qualified in spirit to meet it as men and triumph through it or over it as we serve our fellow men. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 27, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 382) to provide for setting aside an appropriate day as a National Day of Prayer, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WILLIAMS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. AIKEN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HOEY, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was authorized to hold a hearing this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. KEM, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. KILGORE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, yesterday evening when I made the motion to recess I offered to yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] for 5 minutes, or a reasonable time. He evidently did not hear the "reasonable time." My reason for not yielding the floor at that time was that three Senators who were present were under the care of physicians. I knew that the motion to take a recess would be resisted, and that a vote would be necessary. I am perfectly willing that the Senator from Missouri shall have the floor. I think he is entitled to the floor to make his speech. I wish to be fair at all times with Senators on both sides of the aisle.

Before the Senator from Missouri speaks, if he does not object, I should like to ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and to transact other routine business, without debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED GARRISON RESERVOIR ROAD RELOCATION—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, WILLIAMS COUNTY, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Williams County, Williston, N. Dak., favoring in principle the proposed Garrison Reservoir road-relocation plan.

I call attention to the fact that if the dam is left at the high level, it will mean that the city of Williston will have to be diked in order to keep it from being flooded.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Corps of Engineers has proposed a program of relocation of roads in the areas of Williams County to be affected by the operation of the reservoir of the Garrison Dam; and

Whereas a substantial portion of such program will be required by a maximum normal operating pool level of 1,830 feet above sea level; and

Whereas the proposed relocation program will be implemented by the Federal Government substantially without any cost whatever to Williams County, and such program is compatible with a maximum normal operating pool level of 1,830 feet above sea level; and

Whereas we have heretofore, on several occasions, expressed our steadfast opposition to the operation of the maximum normal pool level of such reservoir at an elevation higher than 1,830 feet above sea level; and

Whereas we stand firm in our conviction that a higher maximum normal pool level of such reservoir is wholly unnecessary and is detrimental to the interests of this area and should be vigorously opposed; and

Whereas we believe the proposed road-relocation program will materially improve the system of county highways in Williams County and thereby reduce road-building expense to Williams County: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of County Commissioners of Williams County, N. Dak., That we do hereby approve in principle the Proposed Garrison Reservoir road-relocation plan submitted by the Corps of Engineers, but without obligation on the part of Williams County to contribute financially to the construction phases thereof, and without withdrawing our firm and unaltered opposition to the operation of the maximum normal pool level of such reservoir in excess of 1,830 feet above sea level; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of North Dakota and to the district office of the Corps of Engineers.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 2760. A bill for the relief of Tokuko Kobayashi and her minor son; and

S. 2761. A bill for the relief of Norma J. Roberts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.